

# PROCEEDINGS

---

## 2010 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

---

104th Annual Convention  
January 14-17, 2010  
Atlanta, Georgia





**THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION**  
**P.O. Box 6222**  
**Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222**  
**317/917-6222**  
**NCAA.org**  
**July 2010**

**NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.**  
**©2010 by the National Collegiate Athletic Association**

## OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

### JANUARY 14, 2010

*(The 104th annual business session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel, in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 14, 2010, was called to order at 3:30 p.m., by NCAA Executive Committee chair Ed Ray.)*

#### OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Ray:** Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to the opening session of the 2010 NCAA Convention. I am Ed Ray, president of Oregon State University and chair of the NCAA Executive Committee. I have the pleasure of moderating this opening session and welcoming each of you to Atlanta, Georgia.

As we begin the business portion of the 2010 NCAA Convention, I think it is appropriate that we pause for a moment to acknowledge the tragic humanitarian crisis unfolding in Haiti. The sheer devastation reflected in media coverage is truly sobering, and we hope that aid arrives quickly to those directly affected. Our thoughts and prayers go out to the people of Haiti and to those in our membership who have family and friends affected by this terrible tragedy.

With me on the dais this afternoon are the respective chairs of the Divisions I, II and III presidential governing bodies. I am pleased to welcome James Barker, Clemson University, chair of the Division I Board of Directors; Stephen Jordan, Metropolitan State College of Denver, chair of the Division II Presidents Council, and Paul Tribble, Christopher Newport University, chair of the Division III Presidents Council.

New chairs will guide all three divisions in 2010, but I would like to commend Presidents Barker, Jordan and Tribble for their exemplary leadership. Each has made a significant contribution to the Association, and we look forward to your continued leadership in Association activities in the years ahead.

I know how much time and energy goes into leading a Division I Board or Division II or III Council, and I ask each of you out there today to please join me in thanking Presidents Barker, Jordan and Tribble for their outstanding service to the Association. *(Applause)*

At this time I am pleased to introduce an individual who during his 11 years of tenure at the national office has provided outstanding leadership to the Association on a number of fronts, including fiscal responsibility, strategic planning and the overall administration of the national office.

Currently, he is serving in a critical role for the Association during a time of important change. We will hear more about the State of the Association later in this session. But please join me in welcoming interim president, Dr. Jim Isch, who will introduce a special guest to the 2010 NCAA Convention.

Ladies and gentlemen, Jim Isch. *(Applause)*

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORABLE ARNE DUNCAN

**NCAA Interim President Isch:** Thank you, Ed. In America uniquely we believe in the value of athletics aligned with education because we believe sports participation enhances the work of the classroom with leadership characteristics, engineered on the field and on the court.

If ever there is a great example of that alignment, that coming together, scholarship and character, it is today's keynote speaker, U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan.

As the country's highest-ranking education administrator, Secretary Duncan brings his academic and athletic achievements to bear on what he determines the moral obligation of society, and an economic imperative to education.

As an undergraduate in sociology at Harvard University, where he graduated magna cum laude, Secretary Duncan was also co-captain of the basketball team and the first team Academic All-American. He also played professional basketball for four years in Australia, from 1987 to 1991.

Professional basketball's loss was education's gain.

Before his confirmation as Secretary of Education a year ago, he was chief executive officer of Chicago Public Schools and ran the Ariel Education Initiative, a nonprofit educational foundation that helped fund college educations for inner-city children.

He has served on numerous boards, including Jobs for America's Graduates, Junior Achievement and the NABC Foundation.

In 2008, he was honored by the Civic Federation of Chicago and the Anti-Defamation League.

Education Secretary Duncan has said the civil rights issue of our generation is the most pressing issue facing America.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are in for a treat. It is my great pleasure to present today's keynote speaker. Please help me welcome U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. *(Applause)*

## REMARKS - THE HONORABLE ARNE DUNCAN

**U.S. Secretary of Education Duncan:** Thank you so much, Jim, for that kind introduction. I would like to also acknowledge Russlynn Ali, who is from my staff, our assistant secretary for the Office of Civil Rights, who is doing an extraordinary job.

I just want to begin by briefly acknowledging the extraordinary leadership of Myles Brand. I know you are going to honor him later this afternoon. As everyone here knows he was a man of just extraordinary integrity, of real courage. He was a man of great principle.

He was unafraid of controversy. He didn't ask for it, but he didn't run from it either. He was committed to truly integrated higher education and intercollegiate athletics, and he had the absolute belief in the transformative power of intercollegiate athletics.

He was committed to diversity, he was committed to inclusion, and his leadership, I think, has brought the NCAA to an entirely new height.

I was honored and privileged to meet his wife, Peg, and his son, Josh. If they are here, I would like to ask them to stand. Are they in the audience? I am not sure that they are here. Let's please give Dr. Brand a huge round of applause and thank him for his leadership. *(Applause)*

I am absolutely honored to be here, and I want to apologize to my speech writers who write me these wonderful speeches and I never use them. But being here today is really personal to me and my family. My dad passed away two and a half years ago, but I think the previous 29 years before that he was the faculty athletics representative to the NCAA from the University of Chicago. He loved this community, he was honored to be a part of the NCAA family.

He would come back from the conferences and talk to me and my brother and sister about the issues that you were grappling with, and he believed that the universities had this huge important dual mission: first, to educate its students and, secondly, to prepare them for life.

He thought there was no better way to prepare students for life than through great interscholastic programs.

Being a part of this family meant so much to him. So, it is really an honor for me to be here.

My sister was a much better athlete than I was. She was the direct beneficiary of Title IX, and this is personal. Whether my sister who had those opportunities, my mother who was probably the best athlete in the family who didn't have those opportunities, and whether it is now my 8-year-old daughter who is going to have more opportunities than any of them, the commitment to Title IX is hugely important.

I want to tell you a little bit about my upbringing. My dad, as I said, was a professor at the University of Chicago for about 40 years, and almost 30 as a part of your family. We lived in the Hyde Park area, a diverse, integrated, middle-class community, tied to the University of Chicago.

During that entire time, my mother ran an inner-city tutoring program on the South Side of Chicago, only about a mile and a half from where we lived, but a very, very different world.

It was a neighborhood challenged with huge violence, desperate poverty, and she sort of committed to trying to make a difference in the lives of the children in that community, and raised my brother and my sister and myself as part of her program. So, I got to see every day, both in the university community and in this other South Side community what I think was the best and sometimes unfortunately the worst of what sports had to offer.

At the University of Chicago, a Division III program with a great academic reputation, I would play pick-up basketball with students who were Rhodes Scholars and had their priorities absolutely in place, and who had been led by a university that actually got it.

I grew up playing pick-up basketball in schoolyards and park districts around Chicago on the south and west sides. I played with lots and lots of legends, Mark Aguirre, Isiah Thomas, Terry Cummings, and when he came to Chicago, Michael Jordan.

I played with many schoolyard legends who had been phenomenal players and had not quite made the pros, and the vast majority of them had frankly not received college degrees. So, they helped to make their universities successful.

In a couple of cases, they actually helped the university to win national championships, but then at the end of the day they didn't have their degree. They didn't have anything to show for it. When the ball stopped bouncing for them, when those opportunities disappeared, they had very few opportunities in life.

Growing up and playing with some of these legends and becoming close with them, unfortunately, I saw too many die early, come to violent deaths, and I always tried to figure out why some people I grew up with from very tough communities were successful and some weren't.

All were very talented, all of whom went to college, only some of them completed. As I got older, I came to realize the ones that were successful beyond the athletic field, beyond the basketball court were those that received their college degree. Those that didn't, almost to a man, struggled tremendously in life once those glory days had faded.

So, it was deeply ingrained in me very, very early that the dividing line is really around education, and that where we

give people the opportunity to be successful and when we help them get that diploma they have a lifetime opportunity ahead of them.

When we don't do that, we condemn them to continued cycles of poverty and social failure, and those brief fleeting years of athletic fame really build little that is lasting.

So, I was lucky enough to witness all that in growing up, the good and bad, and everything in between. I was lucky to go to a university that had its priorities in order and to be coached by two coaches who both are athletic directors today, Frank McLaughlin and Peter Roby, who were actually teaching us and instilling in us the right values.

To have an athletic director like Jack Reardon, not just an athletic program, but across the university, made sure we were learning.

I had a great assistant coach, Tom Thibodeau, who is the assistant coach for the Boston Celtics now, who I am always indebted to because he encouraged a slow guy from Harvard to think about maybe playing professional basketball and helped me get a tryout with the Boston Celtics.

When that didn't work out, he convinced a coach in Australia to take a chance on me. I will never forget this. It was pre-Internet, and he told my coach in Australia I was like Larry Bird, but better with the ball. Every time I made a mistake in Australia, the coach would just shake his head and say, "Like Larry Bird with the ball." He got me a job, and he has gone on to do great, great things.

I still love to play. I still love to compete. I still play in three tournaments around the country. I love the camaraderie. But I think the reason I am so passionate about sports is obviously not the winning and not the camaraderie, it is really, as the introduction by Jim, the life lessons that we all know I think are not just taught on the playing field or on the court, but are best taught in the playing field on the court.

If the university is serious about my dad's dual mission of the university educating their students and preparing them for life, I think there is no better way to give every student a chance to fulfill their tremendous academic and social and leadership potential than by giving that student-athlete experience, making it part of the highest quality.

Bill Bradley, who is one of my personal heroes, wrote a book called "Values of the Game." He talked about so much of what you learn, and again these lessons were so tough to learn in a biology lab or a computer class, but I think the ideal teaching spot, the ideal teaching location is in that sports team.

He talked about passion and finding what you love. He talked about discipline. He talked about unselfishness and teamwork, and learning to help someone else, and by doing that you help yourself.

He talked about learning respect. He talked about demonstrating courage. He talked about developing your leadership skills. He talked about responsibility, about making no excuses.

He talked about resilience, how you handle the defeat, how you handle diversity. He talked about imagination and being creative and finding solutions to problems. Obviously, where better to learn those skills than on a playing field? What you guys have collectively created for 400,000 student-athletes each year is simply remarkable. I think it is something of unparalleled duty.

I think that the power, the extraordinary power of intercollegiate sports, can train young men and women in ways that can't be done in any other way. So, my challenge here is that when the vast majority of you are leading with the right values and instilling with the right values, why do we allow, the NCAA, the universities, why do we allow sports to be tainted when the vast majority of coaches and athletic directors are striving to instill the right values?

Why do we allow our reputations, our universities and the NCAA as a whole to be stained by the actions of a few? It is a niche that you have created this collectively. You have created this living, this breathing, this evolving masterpiece.

But it continues, unfortunately, to be very publicly defamed by renegade coaches or institutions who don't respect you, who don't respect your values, and in their heart have no true concern for the student-athletes they are supposed to lead.

How do we get rid of the tiny, tiny minority that stains the rest of us? How do we raise the bar to protect it again and to protect our institutions and to protect sports?

I have three ideas just to share, none of which I think are that difficult, many of which I think are common sense, but take real courage.

First, I would encourage you to slow down a little bit. I think there is a pace in which folks are moving that has gotten a little bit out of control. We now have universities signing eighth-graders to their colleges. I am not sure how an eighth-grader, who doesn't know where they are going to go to high school, can accurately and thoughtfully and strategically pick the best college for them.

I think we should wait a little bit, slow down, think about doing that maybe in their junior or sophomore year, but signing students in the eighth and ninth grades belies any common sense.

Secondly, the NCAA doesn't control any of this at all, and I understand that. But in areas like basketball where we have this one and done rule, where student-athletes are trying to go to the NBA after one year, I think we need to slow down

there, as well.

I think our sports are feeling this out a little bit better. Baseball, I think, has an interesting model where that tiny percent, that .001 percent of student-athletes who are truly ready for the pros come out of high school. A Kevin Garnett or a Kobe Bryant, they have the opportunity to do that. But those who are not quite ready there, let's think about two years or three years in college before they go on to the pros.

When we talk about one and done, many of you know that what that actually means is that students take about six hours of classes for a couple of months. They are not truly student-athletes, they are simply passing through your institutions on the way to something else. Some of them make it; some will wash out very, very quickly.

I think having more time in your institutions around your coaches maturing, growing up and getting a true sense of college experience in that life and hopefully whether they make the big time or not, coming back to their institutions to get their degrees later on, I think would be a step in the right direction.

Secondly, I think we have to value graduation rates at a much higher rate. The president has challenged me and challenged the country that we again want to lead the world in the percent of college graduates. Our country 20 to 25 years ago used to have the highest percentage of college graduates in the world. We are flat line. Other countries have passed us by.

I think as a country we are paying a price for that. I am convinced we have to educate our way for a better economy. As all of you know, I think athletics and student-athletes with the right values can be a huge part of that success story. We all know the myth of dumb jocks is just that, a myth, or a stereotype.

Athletes generally across the board graduate at a much higher rate than nonathletes. I think we have to be much more thoughtful about how we do this. I think that the coaches' job obviously has to be so much more than wins and losses and bringing in money and courting the alumni. It truly has to be about what are they doing to help students, not just win games for them but put on their cap and gown four years, five years down the road.

If you looked at the NCAA tournament last year, almost a quarter of the teams that played in the tournament, 25 percent of those teams graduated less than 40 percent of their players. Four teams that competed last March had zero percent of their players graduate. That is zero. By contrast, in the same tournament, Wake Forest, Florida State, Robert Morris, Utah State and Western Kentucky graduated 100 percent of their players, white and African-Americans. Somehow we have to level the playing field here.

I propose, and some people might think this is too tough, I would think this is almost a little bit soft, that if you weren't graduating X percentage of your players, because of the 40 percent as a starting point, then you would be ineligible for postseason competition. Some folks might think that is tough, but when you think about that, if you can't graduate two out of five of your players, what are they doing at your university and what role are you playing in helping them develop?

I ran the Chicago Public Schools before I came here. There was a program that I tried to bar the coach from recruiting our student-athletes. There was a university that had zero percent of their players graduate over the previous four years. That was zero. I would strongly encourage other school systems to look at the universities that are recruiting our student-athletes and figure out if that is the long-term right home for their players?

I know this can be tough. I know it is a challenge, but we have to think about our true north. We have to think about what brought us to this. When we think about that, I think about people like Eddie Robinson, who worked with students who didn't always have the best academic backgrounds and came from very difficult home situations and communities, and over 57 years he graduated 80 percent of his players.

I think about the legendary story of him walking the halls and the dormitories at dawn ringing a cowbell to make sure they were in class on time. So I think we need to think about this and think about raising that bar over time, for having some minimum threshold for postseason competition across sports.

Then, finally, I propose a bit of a bar again with coaches. I would like for us to empower coaches more, and I would also like to hold them to a higher standard of accountability.

Let me explain what I mean. I know many coaches chafe at the restrictions on out of season and their inability to work with their own players. I actually am very, very sympathetic to that. When you think about other students in the university setting, we don't tell a budding computer scientist that they can't work in the computer lab in the offseason. We don't tell the aspiring violinist that he or she can't work with the best of their faculty mentors to continue to develop their skills year round.

But we tell our coaches they can't do things during the offseason. I think we do that because we have a low bar for coaches; we have low expectations. So I would like to flip that a little bit to where you have good outcomes, where you run a clean program, we should increase your contact with players in the offseason.

I would love to have coaches working one-on-one and doing individual development with their players. I can't think of a better use of a coach's time; I can't think of a better positive relationship between a great coach and a player, and I think there is no harm there.

Where programs are living with the wrong values, I think we need to hold coaches personally responsible for the lack of leadership. These are antidotes, but just to challenge. We had a couple of football teams, one football team over the past four years had 30 players arrested.

We had another program that has had 24 players arrested, nine of them felonies. We have programs out of control, where the average arrest per year is higher than the team's GPA. That is a challenge. We need to be honest about that.

When we can prove that a head coach or an assistant coach is intentionally or flagrantly in violation of the NCAA rules, I think generally today one thing happens, the institution itself is sanctioned, maybe scholarships are forfeited or maybe in extreme situations the team can't play in the postseason.

Current and future players are penalized, but often not the bad actors. I think this is simply too soft. I think there are two things that can help address this. First, I think the coach himself or herself should be personally sanctioned and face potential suspension or barred from coaching for a year or two, or a lifetime depending on the seriousness of the infractions.

What we see far too often is coaches that run a program into the ground, get in trouble, but bounce to the next institution, leave chaos and disarray in their effort to move on, often, amazing to me, at a much higher salary. I think if sanctions followed the coach, it would make it much more difficult for those institutions to hire them and make them think twice.

I think the coach as a leader has to take personal responsibility. Far too often, the player who is involved in mischief moves on. The coach moves on, no penalties to them, but the students and the university get to receive the penalty.

I also would like to see if a school faces those kinds of penalties and the school is prohibited from going into the tournament, that those players who weren't engaged in the mischief, in the bad behavior, those players would have a right to transfer to other institutions.

Basically, during a toxic environment through no fault of their own, they are the ones that are penalized. They are the ones that pay the price, and again, the ones that create the chaos move on and do other things. Those players should be allowed to transfer and should be able to play immediately.

What you guys have, in conclusion, I think as I thought about it on the plane ride here, in addition to the military, you are probably the most important. You are the largest and you are probably the best developer of character in the nation. You are literally training the nation's future leaders.

I can tell you personally how grateful I am. I speak on behalf of millions of student-athletes to let you know how much you have shaped our lives. The lessons that I try and live by every single day, the lessons I try and help instill in our nation's schools were taught because of your culture, because of your leadership. Please cherish that opportunity, know how lucky we are to have you leading us, but please protect that sacred obligation, that sacred opportunity with everything that you have. Thank you so much, and thank you for your hard work.

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

**Mr. Ray:** Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you so much for your time and being with us here today. We appreciate your taking the time out of your extremely busy schedule to participate in the NCAA Convention, to reinforce the importance that we as an organization continue to place on the value of higher education in our society.

## **REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

It is customary at this point in the opening business session for the chair to present the report of the Executive Committee. As many of you know, the NCAA federated governance structure allows each division the autonomy to address its varied issues. However, it is important for all of us to keep in mind that we gather annually at this Convention as one Association.

The NCAA Executive Committee is composed of 16 presidents and chancellors from the three divisions, the president of the NCAA, three nonvoting members, the chair of the Division I Leadership Council, and the chairs of the Management Councils in Divisions II and III.

The Executive Committee's duties and responsibilities include approval of the Association's budget, oversight of Association-wide issues, initiation and settlement of litigation, and employment of the NCAA president.

With that in mind, I would like to report briefly on what has been a busy and productive year for the Association. This past October, the NCAA Executive Committee appointed a six-president panel, which I am chairing, to oversee the search for a successor to the late NCAA President Myles Brand. The panel is structured similar to the search model the NCAA used when it selected President Brand in 2002, and will engage in a process that is inclusive and thorough.

This is the highest priority of the search committee as we solicit input from various constituents.

Over the course of these few days in Atlanta, we are engaging in a number of constituent groups to seek feedback on the attributes which are critical for the next president to possess. Our target is to have the new president in place by the beginning of the next academic year.

Last spring, the NCAA Executive Committee approved a recommendation from its Finance Committee that as a first

option, all future NCAA committee meetings will be held in Indianapolis.

Presidential leadership boards within the NCAA governance structure already adhere to the policy, but the new policy applies to the more than 200 NCAA governance and sports committees throughout Divisions I, II and III.

Executive Committee members cited increased efficiency and effectiveness of the national office operations as reasons for the change, which is projected to save about half a million dollars a year when fully implemented.

In August, the Executive Committee adopted a policy related to sports wagering and the conduct of NCAA championships. The policy states that, "No predetermined or nonpredetermined session of an NCAA championship may be conducted in a state with legal wagering that is based upon single-game betting." This includes high school, college or professional, in a sport in which the NCAA conducts a championship.

Single-game betting is defined as wagering that involves either a money line or points spread wager. This policy, in fact, would not apply to those states that may offer parlay betting, lottery tickets or sports pull tabs.

The Executive Committee approved the policy to ensure the integrity of the game, to provide consistency in awarding NCAA championships and to address student-athlete well-being concerns.

## **MEMORIAL RESOLUTION**

Finally, as has been the tradition during the opening business session, the NCAA will honor athletics staff members and student-athletes who passed away during this past year with a memorial resolutions report.

At this time I would like to ask you to look at your convention program to see the names of those institutional staff members associated with athletics and student-athletes who died in 2009.

I ask the delegates, guests and media representatives to please stand now and observe a moment of silence for those men and women who have passed away since we last gathered. Please stand.

Thank you very much. Please be seated. There is no question that each one of these individuals has impacted those around them: teammates, administrators, their families and friends.

While the pursuit of the highest level of athletic and academic opportunities is what connects these individuals and connects each of us, it is the interaction in the relationships among teammates, colleagues and peers that serve as a chain to make that connection even stronger. So, when we lose a friend or a peer in our journey, we lose a link in the chain that becomes noticeable by its absence.

Certainly, this is the case for one of the individuals we lost in 2009, former President Myles Brand. At this time I ask Michael Adams, president of the University of Georgia and past Executive Committee chair, to speak in tribute to Myles and his impact during his six years as the Association's president.

## **NCAA PRESIDENT'S GERALD R. FORD AWARD**

**Mr. Adams (University of Georgia):** Thank you, Ed. I appreciate it and certainly on behalf of all of my colleagues here in Georgia, we are honored to welcome each of you here to Atlanta for this special occasion.

For those of you who were able to attend or watch the tribute to Myles Brand this past October, I suspect that much like me you were struck by two seemingly polar extremes. Myles was both predictable and surprising. He was relentless, consistent about setting the highest standards possible in everything that he touched, and yet the breadth and depth of his many interests and the diversity of people he touched was, in my opinion, truly astonishing.

I remarked at that tribute then that in the midst of the public's interest in what we do, the emotions that intercollegiate athletics competition brings to the forefront and the controversy that oftentimes follows the decisions we have made together over the last few years, in that climate we were led by a courtly, thoughtful, manly, mild philosopher.

Myles' focus was on creating opportunities so that those people around him would be in a better place as a result. He was committed to creating an environment where the highest academic standards were always at the forefront. He was prepared to handle the groundswell of interest, both negatively and positively, that came as a result of his and the Association's actions.

In his words, that you have read many times, this was simply the price of leadership. Equal to his passion for the goals he outlined for the Association was his desire to also celebrate the positive aspects of intercollegiate athletics about which Secretary Duncan just spoke.

Myles was a self-described pathological optimist. He saw the best in people, and certainly those dedicated to the mission of intercollegiate athletics. This was the genius, I believe, behind his creation of the NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award.

While we already honor a number of current and former student-athletes in a number of ways, Myles wanted to honor individuals who provided significant leadership to intercollegiate athletics over the long course of his or her career.

Some of the honorees include The Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, Bill Friday, Birch Bayh, John Wooden, Christine Grant, James Frank, Billie Jean King, and today I am proud to say we add to that list of impressive individuals who have impacted intercollegiate athletics over their entire lifetime, Myles Brand.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Time has marched on since Myles left us almost four months ago. The priorities he set forth on behalf of student-athletes continue, I believe, to be the cornerstones of this Association's agenda.

Certainly, he will be forever remembered for moving forward an academic reform initiative that ensures college athletes are students first. Even more broadly, Myles influenced and changed the way the public, the media and, most importantly, those of us in higher education think about and what we expect from intercollegiate athletics.

He never let us forget that the justification for college sports is that it was rooted in educational value. There is no question that his impact in higher education will be felt for decades to come.

But one area that may be far greater than what he even may have anticipated is the progress that will be made as a result of an endowed chair that has been established in Myles' name at Indiana University.

Dr. Michael McRobbie, the president of Indiana University, announced that the tribute, the establishment of a chair as a means to support research activities, manuscript preparation, graduate student assistance and other requirements of an academic scholar.

President McRobbie further noted that the dollars raised for this effort will be used to support a renowned basic scientist's or physician's researcher, who specializes in cancer.

As the former chair of the Executive Committee and by action of the Executive Committee, it is my distinct honor to announce today that the NCAA will donate \$500,000 to the Myles Brand Endowed Chair in Cancer Research at the Indiana University School of Medicine in honor of Myles Brand.

Myles meant so much to the Association that it is a fitting way to demonstrate our tremendous appreciation for his leadership, his vision and for his limitless passion for the pursuits of our student-athletes.

Indeed, this is a proper thing for the Association to do. *(Applause)*

We are honored today especially to have two dear members of Myles' family with us. Join me, please, in welcoming to the stage Myles' son, Josh Brand, and wife, Peg Brand, who will accept the Ford Award on behalf of Myles Brand. Join me in welcoming them.

*(Whereupon, a prolonged standing ovation is had at this time.)*

Josh and Peg, on behalf of this Association, I have the distinct honor today of announcing this contribution to the Myles Brand Endowed Chair, but also to present to you on behalf of the Association his name being added to the journal of the Gerald R. Ford Award. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

## **RESPONSE - MRS. PEG BRAND**

**Mrs. Brand:** Josh and I are the new Brand team. We are going to divide duties, but I would like to thank the NCAA for the donation to the Myles Brand Chair.

Many people have asked over the last year what would Myles say? As a fellow philosopher who co-authored with Myles, I would like to push you the extra step and ask what would Myles think? That is what always came before his saying.

Your former president, Myles Brand, was steadfastly proud to serve you, this wonderful complicated body of dynamic people, the organization of the NCAA. If he were standing here today, he would be your biggest advocate and your most enthusiastic colleague, urging you on to higher standards and greater heights leading you forward.

He might also deliver a 15-minute lecture, trained as he was to talk until the bell rang at the end of a class. Most of all, he would be truly humbled to accept the 2010 Gerald R. Ford Award because it comes with such affection and respect through the team with whom he worked for nearly seven years.

Myles was always a team player, having abandoned early on in his career the path of the solitary philosopher. Instead, over the years he chose to work in collaboration with department faculty, academic chairs and deans, various colleges and campuses. The crowning glory, however, of his academic career was his time spent with you.

Myles loved his work; it was never really a job. He served the membership in a way that he hoped would inspire others, with concern and commitment to shared values that always placed the student-athlete first. He was always grateful for the ideas you shared and the discussions and arguments that followed. He would be even more grateful for the acknowledgment you have brought to this collaborative effort by means of this award.

Of course, I was not present when the initial conversations took place inaugurating the Ford Award, but I would like to think that Myles intended to honor recipients of the award in a way similar to the way that Gerald R. Ford himself was honored at the University of Michigan, where he played football in the early 1930s and was voted Most Valuable Player by his teammates.

Ford apparently, as reported, started every game as center his senior year. Myles started every day focused on the work of the NCAA, whether it was meeting at the headquarters in Indianapolis, visiting conferences or commissioners, or his favorite pastime of all, meeting student-athletes during campus visits across the country.

On behalf of the Brand family, thank you for celebrating Myles' contribution to higher education and athletics by voting him the Most Valuable Player of the NCAA's team.

It is a treasure that is bestowed back upon you, his fellow teammates, in celebration, as well. Thank you again, and all the best in the future to the NCAA. *(Applause)*

## REMARKS BY MR. JOSH BRAND

**Mr. Brand:** Thank you, President Adams. On behalf of the entire family, I just want to take a quick moment to express our deep gratitude to all of you for the NCAA's generous contribution to the Myles Brand Chair in Cancer Research. Also, I want to thank Jim Isch, the Executive Committee and the many friends we have in the NCAA for your unwavering support during this very difficult past few months for us.

When several close friends of my father first approached him at last year's Final Four in Detroit with the idea of creating the chair in his name, he immediately embraced the idea but was unsure whether there would be enough interest to raise the needed funds. Well, with your generous \$500,000 gift, we have already raised close to \$3 million for the chair.

Importantly, we have had over 200 separate individuals and organizations donate to the chair, showing the broad support that this chair has received. As a result, Indiana University will soon begin recruiting the world-class research cancer team.

This research team will focus on pancreatic cancer, the disease that took my father's life. Pancreatic cancer is the most lethal of all cancers. Approximately, 40,000 Americans in a year die with that disease and almost that many die from it each year. There is very little in the way of early detection and, as we know all too well, no known cure for this disease.

With your generous support, IU will soon be able to hire a talented team that we hope will finally contribute to finding a cure so that other families will not have to experience the tragedy that we did last year. Thank you again from the bottom of our hearts. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ray:** In memory of Myles' contribution to the NCAA, you will each receive a copy of a commemorative publication in your hotel room tomorrow. This special item captures quotes from various speeches on many issues that Myles addressed during his tenure as NCAA president.

For those of you not staying at either hotel property, I ask you to go to the registration desk here in the Hyatt or the information desk at the Marriott Marquis to pick up your copy.

If I can be allowed the personal privilege of an observation. I knew Myles back in the mid-1980s when he first became provost at The Ohio State University, and I had the pleasure and the honor to observe Myles' performance in a number of different roles at that time and since where he served with great distinction.

But I have said and we have all talked about the events of the last year, and I mentioned the search team earlier and the kind of effort that will be made to find the next leader for this Association.

I think that in his capacity as president of the NCAA, Myles was as close to pinch perfect as anyone I have ever seen performing in a role of leadership. So we have a daunting challenge ahead of us in our search effort. I also want to make one other quick observation. I think the division presidents will agree with me. I have observed two really remarkable efforts over the course of the last year, and I want to point them out.

Michael Adams, who just spoke, I think served with incredible grace and poise and strength as chair of the Executive Committee over the course of the last year. He was a friend, a confidante and a tremendous source of support for Myles during very, very difficult times.

The second observation that I have made is that I also saw a staff, beginning with Jim Isch, that performed in an extraordinary and capable dedicated fashion in a very, very difficult time.

So I would ask Jim and the other members of the staff, and Mike Adams to stand so that the rest of us can recognize them one more time. *(Applause)*

We now move to what I consider to be the key moment of the NCAA Convention, the State of the Association Address. So, without further ado, please join me in welcoming again Interim President Jim Isch. *(Applause)*

## STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

**Interim President Isch:** Thank you, Ed. Thank you for the time also that you give this organization. I am reminded I talked to him a few years ago in the meeting of the Finance Committee to become the finance chair, and he asked how much time it would take. I said, "Not all that much." Then I said, "Would you be the Investment Committee chair? I don't think it will take that much time."

Then I said, "Will you be the Audit Committee chair, and it will not take that much time?" Then, finally, I said, "Hey, will you take the Executive Committee chair?" And he said, "I am going to stop taking calls from you." *(Laughter)*

I don't think we will be calling you and asking you to do too much more, although you did agree to do the search committee. Thank you for that.

I also want to thank Secretary Duncan for his thoughtful and inspiring remarks. Most importantly, I want to thank him for taking the time to be here and to support the collegiate model of athletics in America. *(Applause)*

This is a bittersweet moment for me personally. I am pleased to spend time with the NCAA delegates and guests this

afternoon. It is an honor to stand before you as the interim president of the NCAA.

On the other hand, this is a time when our late president and great friend, Myles Brand, would normally have been addressing you and providing you with his comments on the State of the Association.

I am pleased we have had the opportunity to honor the many and significant contributions Myles made to intercollegiate athletics and to pay respect to a life immersed in the academy and in service to higher education.

I want to add my thanks to Peg and Josh for being with us today and for their comments. *(Applause)*

I want to take a few moments to comment on the condition of the enterprise Myles touched and upon which he left his imprint and to challenge us all with regard to the year that lies ahead.

While the bulk of my remarks will address broad concerns on the fiscal model for intercollegiate athletics, I would be remiss if I did not note the progress that has been made in two other areas, academic reform and diversity hiring.

If Myles came into the NCAA presidency with a mandate, it was to confront concerns with the academic success of student-athletes in some sports, and especially in Division I.

Despite a number of reform efforts over the previous 15 years or so and even with some indicators that student-athletes were doing as well or better than other students, the graduation success of certain student-athletes in key sports was lagging behind.

Divisions II and III had their own concerns.

What has transpired over the last seven years is remarkable. New standards for initial eligibility and progress-toward-degree have been put in place. New metrics, such as APR and GSR in Division I and ASR in Division II, have become well-established. And the trends in terms of improved graduation rates are all up.

With the last reporting period in November, the Graduation Success Rate for the cohort that entered Division I institutions in 2002 is 79 percent, one percentage point from the aspirational 80 percent goal Myles set a few years ago. And in Division II, the Academic Success Rate stands at 71 percent.

The trend lines are all significantly improved. Division I men's basketball has seen a 10 percentage point increase over the last eight years. Baseball is up five points, and football is up three points.

Next year's graduating cohort, those who entered in 2003, will be the first that had to meet increased progress-toward-degree standards. That is, they had to make 20 percent progress each year toward their bachelor's degree.

Division II has its Life in the Balance Initiative designed to address issues around student-athlete well-being but that will also impact academic success. Under consideration at this Convention are legislative proposals intended to provide more time for student-athletes to be students and to fully embrace the campus experience.

Division III is beginning a pilot baseline study to measure the graduation success of student-athletes in that division. This is a critical step for Division III in its efforts to ensure that academic success remains paramount.

The undeniable facts are that most student-athletes come to college to get an education; most are doing better than their counterparts in the general student body; and most are graduating on time in the major of their choosing.

Despite these successes, there are critical issues still to confront. With next spring's APR announcement in Division I, there will likely be increased penalties, including the loss of postseason championship opportunities. There may also be increased pressure to roll back academic reform. That must not happen.

It has been gratifying to see college and university presidents remain strong in their commitment to reform, and I know that will not change.

The Division I Committee on Academic Performance is appropriately undertaking a critical examination of that committee's efforts over the last five years. Central to that examination are three questions:

Are the original goals of the program being achieved?

Are the current APR penalty benchmarks useful in motivating improved academic performance?

Is the current system of penalty filters and waiver directives working as intended?

Data will drive future decisions regarding academic reform as they have in the past. Our target in all this is to modify behavior, to do that in a manner that is fair but that insists on improvement, and critically to graduate student-athletes. That is the promise of academic reform, and nothing less is acceptable.

One of the most frustrating issues in America and in American college sports for decades has been those around diversity hiring. While there has been some success over time in some sports, especially men's basketball, college football head coaching positions have remained stubbornly difficult for individuals of color.

This was an important issue for Myles and one about which he committed considerable time and effort. Rarely did he speak about intercollegiate athletics without touching on his concern with the lack of progress.

He believed that if the hiring process could be affected, the results could be improved; and he worked toward that end. A year ago, he was encouraged by the fact that nearly every search for a new head football coach in Division I included an African-American. It was a good sign.

Myles would be particularly gratified, as I am, with the hiring decisions made this fall. There were 21 head coaching

vacancies in Division I football, and more than a third of those, eight, have been filled with African-American coaches. Six of those were in FBS institutions.

This brings the total number of coaches of color in Division I to 21, 14 in FBS and 7 in FCS schools. Obviously, these are all-time high numbers.

But they are still numbers. When the totals have been as low as they have been for as long as they have, numbers continue to be important.

Ultimately, however, numbers will not be where success comes. We must not settle for reaching such numerical plateau and declare that we have achieved diversity.

Real diversity is about inclusion. It is about understanding the power of a process that seeks out differences, embraces a variety of points of view and hammers out better decisions because a range of perspectives has been considered. The next great frontier in our progress toward diversity in college sports is setting out on a course that avoids assimilation and encourages differences in the process of achieving excellence.

When we have done this, we can stop patting ourselves on the back for improving the numbers.

Finally, I want to spend a few minutes with you, discussing the fiscal model for intercollegiate athletics. Now, I am sure you would expect nothing less from a longtime chief financial officer. I wouldn't want to disappoint you.

Just three years ago, a group of 50 college and university presidents, mostly from Division I, concluded that given the rate of growth in athletics budgets compared to the growth rate elsewhere on campuses, the fiscal model for athletics was not sustainable over time. The task force agreed that while there was no financial crisis either in college sports or higher education, the system was experiencing stress.

That was 2007, times were good, and the economy, we thought, was stable.

However, the task force report foreshadowed what might be in store if the economy took a turn for the worse. It said: "In truth, higher education has monetized the anticipated growth potential of athletics for short-term gratification while mortgaging the long-term financial security of the university if there is a downturn in the fortunes of college sports."

Just three years later, we have experienced a downturn of fortunes that has moved well beyond college sports. And while there are some encouraging signs for recovery, it is too early to declare that crisis has been averted. Unemployment and national and individual debt continue to present challenges to the confidence so critical to fueling the economic engine of a nation and a world.

Almost certainly we know that some revenue streams that helped higher education flourish in the past have been diverted to other segments of the economy. After years of gradually diminishing state funding, public universities across the nation have experienced multiple budget cuts over the last year. And the expectation is for more cuts in the next year.

In the midst of these economic uncertainties, intercollegiate athletics continues to be funded, in many instances, at rates that give concern to both critics and supporters.

And this is a concern not confined to Division I. While Divisions II and III may be more practiced at doing more with less, a struggling economy and nervous markets have little respect for levels of spending. Truth will be told, the same financial characteristics that ensure good fortune will raise all ships will likely run all ships to ground when the economy falters.

Earlier this fall, the Knight Commission released both quantitative and qualitative results from a survey of presidents in the Football Bowl Subdivision of Division I. The commission focused on the FBS because it is the one that spends the most, generates the most television interest, is most often the target of criticism about excesses in intercollegiate athletics, and is able to generate more revenue than any other group of NCAA institutions.

Here are the most important points, in my view, from the report.

Two-thirds of FBS presidents expressed confidence that, concerning current trends in athletics revenues and expenses, athletics operations are sustainable in their current form on their campuses. But less than half believe athletics programs of other institutions in their conference are sustainable.

An overwhelming majority, 85 percent, indicated they felt compensation was excessive in the context of higher education for football and basketball coaches. But they are pessimistic about their ability to control these costs.

Presidents see the "arm race" as divisive, steadily widening the gap between the haves and have-nots.

Presidents would like serious change, but the report noted that they do not see themselves as the force for the needed change.

What was prevalent throughout was a sense among presidents that intercollegiate athletics is spending more than it should, generating more revenue than is good for it, and that the values of higher education are being damaged.

Those are concerns expressed by many within higher education and more broadly.

It will be helpful to provide some perspective to costs of intercollegiate athletics in Division I within all three divisions and the impact on their institutions.

The NCAA research staff released its revenue and expense report for 2008 a couple of months ago and reported to the Division I Board of Directors some trends over the last five years. Here are the key findings from that analysis.

Over the last five years, generated revenues, those revenues generated by the athletics department, grew by a little more than 33 percent. Total expenses grew by just under 43 percent. Expenses outpaced generated revenue by nine percentage points.

However, over the past two years, generated revenues grew by 15 percent and total expenses by 16 percent, indicating a lessening in the growth gap between revenues and expenses.

Five years ago, athletics expenses were growing at rates that were up to 5 percent faster than institutional expenses. In the most recent year of data, however, that gap has closed to almost zero. It will be interesting to follow this trend, and especially so from the perspective of a down economy.

But here is the really fascinating finding: The median level of institutional subsidization in Division I for athletics, regardless of subdivision, is approximately \$8 million. That is to say, there may be emerging a consensus on the monetary value to institutions of supporting a Division I athletics program.

The \$8 million at the FBS level represents roughly 1 percent of total institutional budgets and it is 4 percent to 4.5 percent for the other two subdivisions. Of course, the range of spending within Division I is significant, from \$2.7 million to \$123 million. Such disparities suggest a growing lack of financial homogeneity among a group of institutions all attempting to fly the same banner.

Even among the 120 FBS institutions, the largest budgets are 13 times larger than the smallest budgets.

Taken at face value, these aggregate statistics still did not suggest that intercollegiate athletics is in financial crisis or that athletics budgets present a crisis to the broader security of higher education. But the impact on individual campuses, especially in an oppressive economy, may be very different.

We also must be certain we understand this: At a time when institutions and their faculty are fighting to save positions, 3 percent to 5 percent of an institutional budget could make the difference between keeping a program alive or seeing it perish. So the data can be confusing and conclusions elusive.

To borrow a phrase, what higher education is confronting, and will be for the foreseeable future, is much more than an "academic exercise." The gap between those relatively few programs that can afford -- even in a down economy -- a lifestyle borne in financial prosperity is widening. And the exertion required for some to sustain spending behaviors beyond their means in an effort to preserve their position in their athletics community will likely become too exhaustive to maintain.

Furthermore, these findings also suggest that the sustainability of athletics programs is very much an institutional issue. Institutions, on their own, must find the appropriate value level of supporting athletics on campus.

That was articulated in the task force report in 2007. "The reality," the report said, "for effective reform of spending and revenue-generating behaviors for intercollegiate athletics is this: Each college and university must hold itself accountable for exercising its independent will as an institution of higher education. And it will do that best through well-informed, value driven and courageous presidential leadership."

And that sentiment was the basis for the dashboard indicators initiative in Division I that is in its third year.

Division II is also in the process of creating financial dashboard indicators for use by presidents in that division.

Are better management tools and greater transparency enough? They may not be when external forces in both reality and perception have the upper hand.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to address financial issues with catch-phrase solutions. Intercollegiate athletics at all levels, and certainly more so at some, have the advantage of popularity to drive revenue. But with that must come the discipline to ensure that entertainment is not the guiding principle for how athletics budgets are developed. And I am more convinced than ever that central to remodeling the financial structure for intercollegiate athletics is a process of value-based decision-making.

If we have learned anything from our current economic downturn, it should be that financial prosperity does not make us immune from rapid and disastrous fiscal crisis. And the best approach is for individual institutions to determine the value of athletics to a campus that comports with the values of the institution itself.

But the critical question is whether there is both the will and the practical opportunity for institutions to manage their financial destiny with regard to athletics? If not, what then?

Can institutional discipline be accomplished through national policy? I find it difficult to believe it can. Can we develop a normative approach that establishes some parameters? Perhaps, and I will work with our governance bodies over the next few months to engage in discussion among those lines.

We must take advantage of the difficult times to inform us about financial behaviors that should guide us all the time.

Again, I must tell you that I am honored and humbled to serve as your interim president. I take this role seriously and understand that while it will not be of long duration, the time must be well-spent.

The search for the next president is well under way. Our target is to have that person on board by fall. We, in the national office, are blessed to have had a clear plan of action set out for us by Myles Brand.

I take as the most important contribution I can make in preparation for the next president is to ensure that the path is as clear of obstacles as possible and the ground is ready for new growth.

We cannot flag in our devotion to academic reform, our commitment to financial stability, our efforts to ensure student-athlete well-being, or our pursuit of fairness and inclusion for all.

Thanks to each of you for your support of the national office over the last year and for your confidence that we can and will move forward on all these fronts. I have come to understand that time and travails have no respect for temporary circumstances. Our job is to make progress, and we will do so. Thank you. *(Applause)*

## **CLOSE OF BUSINESS**

**Mr. Ray:** Thank you, Jim, not only for your thoughts on critical issues facing the Association, but also for your steadfast leadership that is evident to the NCAA membership, the national office staff and the constituents we serve.

Two final points. Following this session, the delegates' reception will take place in the Regency Ballroom, which is across the lobby here in the Hyatt Regency Hotel. Finally, thank you all for attending this year's NCAA Convention. I wish you a happy and prosperous new year.

And hearing no objections, the session is adjourned.

*(Whereupon, the Annual Convention was duly adjourned at 4:55 p.m.)*

## 45TH NCAA HONORS CELEBRATION JANUARY 15, 2010

*(The 45th NCAA Honors Celebration was held in the Atlanta Marriott Marquis Hotel, in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 15, 2009, with master of ceremonies Jack Ford presiding.)*

**Mr. Ed Ray:** Please welcome our master of ceremonies, Emmy Award and Peabody Award winner, former Yale football student-athlete and Silver Anniversary Award winner, Jack Ford. *(Applause)*

### HONOREE WELCOME

**Mr. Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, thank you all and good evening. It is my pleasure to welcome you here to the 45th Annual NCAA Honors Celebration. It is an honor for me to be back again to host this event this year in beautiful Atlanta, a city whose slogan is, and quite true, "Every day is an opening day." It is great to be back. It is also wonderful to be a part of this event that truly celebrates the very best.

The people who we are honoring on this stage tonight are our role models in the truest sense.

Their achievements are remarkable; their contributions are significant; their generosity of spirit unequalled; and their leadership undeniable.

That is why we are so very proud to honor them here this evening.

Now, to kick off this evening's ceremony, I would like first to introduce all of our 2010 NCAA honorees.

To do that, and to help me welcome them, please welcome back the Morehouse College "House of Funk" marching band. *(Applause)*

First, the 2010 NCAA Today's Top VIII Award recipients.

From Duke University, Amanda Blumenherst. *(Applause)*

From the University of Georgia, Courtney Kupets. *(Applause)*

From Pittsburg State University, Venessa Lee. *(Applause)*

From Michigan State University, Jeff Lerg. *(Applause)*

From Wheaton College (Illinois), Kent Raymond. *(Applause)*

From the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Brittany Rogers. *(Applause)*

From Arizona State University, Sarah Stevens. *(Applause)*

From the University of Florida, Tim Tebow. *(Applause)*

Now, the 2010 Silver Anniversary Honorees.

From Auburn University, Dr. Gregg K. Carr. *(Applause)*

From Boston College, Doug Flutie. *(Applause)*

From the University of California, Los Angeles, Jackie Joyner-Kersey. *(Applause)*

From the University of Hawaii, Manoa, Maureen O'Toole-Purcell. *(Applause)*

From the University of Florida, Deb Richard. *(Applause)*

And one honoree who could not be with us tonight: From the University of Southern California, Jack Del Rio. *(Applause)*

Our first 2010 Inspiration Award. Representing the 2010 Bluffton University basketball team, coach James Grandey and Cody McPherson. *(Applause)*

Our second 2010 NCAA Inspiration Award, from the U.S. Military Academy, Lieutenant Colonel Gregory D. Gadson. *(Applause)*

Our first 2010 Award of Valor recipient, from Concordia College, Moorhead, Roxana Saberi. *(Applause)*

Our second 2010 Award of Valor recipient, from Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Captain Richard Phillips. *(Applause)*

And finally, the distinguished recipient of the 2010 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award: From Bowdoin College, former United States Senator George J. Mitchell. *(Applause)*

Ladies and gentlemen, the 2010 NCAA Honors Award recipients. *(Applause)*

Now, we want to thank the Morehouse College "House of Funk" marching band. *(Applause)* This is indeed an astonishing group of individuals.

During tonight's program, we will introduce you to each one of these award honorees and share a bit of their remarkable stories.

We will do the first half of our presentations before dinner, and then finish up after all of you have had a chance and opportunity to enjoy your dinner and enjoy the people with you.

We will follow the awards dinner with a dessert reception out in the foyer.

Now, before we get started with our honorees, I would like to take a moment to recognize some very special guests here.

First, please welcome NCAA Interim President Jim Isch. *(Applause)*

And now please help us all thank the members of the NCAA Honors Committee for their hard work in selecting tonight's distinguished award recipients. Will the members of the committee please stand for a round of applause? *(Applause)*

Ladies and gentlemen, at yesterday's opening business session of the 2010 NCAA Convention, NCAA Interim President Jim Isch presented the Gerald R. Ford Award to former NCAA President Myles Brand, who, as you know, lost his battle with pancreatic cancer after leading the Association for six years.

The award was accepted by his wife, Peg, who is in attendance this evening. I will ask Peg to please stand for one more round of applause for Myles Brand. *(Applause)*

## **TODAY'S TOP VIII AWARDS**

Our award ceremony begins tonight as we honor the first four of our 2010 Today's Top VIII Award recipients.

The Top VIII Award honors eight outstanding senior student-athletes from the preceding calendar year who have concluded stellar careers both academically and in intercollegiate athletics, and who have demonstrated unparalleled character and leadership traits in their schools and communities.

Let's meet now our first four recipients.

Amanda Blumenherst will leave her mark on Duke University, graduating as the most decorated women's golfer in Blue Devils history, and one of the university's two three-time first-team ESPN the Magazine Academic All-America selections.

Amanda led Duke to the NCAA team championship as a freshman and sophomore in 2006 and 2007. And, in four appearances in the NCAA championship, she had three top five finishes and one top 10 placement.

A 2009 graduate who finished her degree in history with a 3.8 GPA, Amanda earned her LPGA card in December 2009, marking the official beginning of her professional career.

The all-time leader in NCAA gymnastics individual championships with nine wins, Courtney Kupits is the only University of Georgia gymnast to win four NCAA individual titles in a single year, and the only University of Georgia student-athlete to win the Honda-Broderick Cup.

A 15-time All-American, her numerous athletic wins are matched only by her scholarship achievements and her volunteer activities.

Fourteen-time Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association track and field champion Venessa Lee earned NCAA Division II All-America honors in both the indoor and outdoor seasons while at Pittsburg State University.

A three-year member of the MIAA All-Academic team, she began attending the University of Missouri Medical School in fall 2009.

And second all-time in career saves in the NCAA ice hockey record book, Jeff Lerg left Michigan State University with an NCAA championship, four school records, and ranks among the all-time Michigan State University top five in 11 different career/season categories.

Among other awards, Jeff received the 2009 Michigan State Chester Brewer Award for distinguished performance in athletics and scholarship, and a high degree of character, personality and competitive spirit. Let's meet these amazing performers.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome our first group of Today's Top VIII honorees. *(Applause)*

Our first honoree is Amanda Blumenherst. Presenting the award to Amanda is Dan Brooks, Duke University women's head golf coach. *(Applause)*

Congratulations to you now, Amanda.

Earlier we heard that you just earned your LPGA card, which means you are moving on to another level. Talk about the difference between the preparation and work efforts of a student-athlete as opposed to a professional athlete.

**Ms. Blumenherst:** There really isn't much difference. One thing was my major, and I have been able to apply what I got at Duke in the LPGA and still be able to practice as much, and I will really have a tremendous time as an athlete, and travel with the team and it is more an individual team sport than a team sport, and I am working now and just hoping that I will have things to accomplish, and really looking back on my college experience to keep playing and all that. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ford:** Our congratulations to you, Amanda. *(Applause)*

Our second Top VIII winner is Courtney Kupets.

Presenting the award to Courtney is Damon Evans, University of Georgia director of athletics. *(Applause)*

Now, we saw in the video, you said you wanted to get out of the gym and "see what's out there." So, what is out there for you; what are your plans for the future?

**Ms. Kupets:** I wish I could go back to economics. It is hard work. It is my plans to go to graduate school and be an AD.

**Mr. Ford:** There are a lot of people that you should tackle right here. I will be your agent, and we will work this deal out.

Courtney, our congratulations to you.

**Ms. Kupets:** Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ford:** Our next honoree, please welcome Venessa Lee. Presenting the award to Venessa is Dr. Steven A. Scott, the president of Pittsburg State University. *(Applause)*

Congratulations to you. As a track athlete, you spend so much time working and training, and I am sure that a lot of the younger people will look at you and say how are you able to develop so much to the athletics and yet still balance your academics. Can you answer that?

**Ms. Lee:** Well, it has helped me a lot being in a small school, and I had lots of good coaches, and my teachers in education, and they were helpful to me, helped me a lot. I think all that makes you a good student also makes you a good athlete and competitive to do so. I think they go hand-in-hand.

**Mr. Ford:** Venessa Lee, congratulations to you also.

And our final winner in this group, Jeff Lerg.

Presenting the award to Jeff is Mark Hollis, the athletics director at Michigan State University. *(Applause)*

Jeff, in all of your accomplishments in hockey, what I was struck by most was the conversations that you had on the video talking about your Big Brother and Little Brother relationship. We know what it does for many. What did that relationship do for you?

**Mr. Lerg:** First off, being a part of the Big Brothers and Sisters organization was rewarding. I grew up with a lot of people that helped me out and fortunately we had to give back in that, and an experience, and say how much that it has meant to me with my little brother.

**Mr. Ford:** I am sure you helped many a great deal, and I am sure he is proud of it. Jeff, congratulations to you. *(Applause)*

## AWARD OF VALOR

Our next award this evening goes to our first 2010 Award of Valor recipient.

The NCAA Award of Valor is presented to a former student-athlete who, when confronted with a situation involving personal danger, averted or minimized potential disaster by courageous action or noteworthy bravery.

If valor is defined as "the strength of mind or spirit that enables a person to brave danger with boldness and firmness," then Roxana Saberi is the epitome of valor. Roxana's undergraduate work was completed at Minnesota's Concordia College, Moorhead, where she was a three-year defensive starter on the varsity women's soccer team.

After graduating with degrees in communications and French, Roxana went on to receive two graduate degrees before traveling to Iran, her father's birthplace, to pursue her journalism career and her cultural interests.

In late January 2009, Roxana was arrested. It was alleged to be a minor offense, and she was imprisoned.

During that time in prison, she was psychologically intimidated, physically threatened and repeatedly warned that she could be given 10 to 20 years in prison, or the death penalty.

Although she originally confessed to Iranian authorities in the hopes of a speedy release, Roxana's conscience prevailed, and she recanted.

After 101 days in prison, the Iranian Revolutionary Court of Appeals released Roxana with a two-year suspended sentence.

During her incarceration, she was confronted with great personal danger. Yet, throughout the ordeal, she acted with dignity, inner strength and fortitude.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming and honoring Roxana Saberi. *(Applause)*

Presenting the award to Roxana is Pamela Jolicoeur, president of Concordia College, Moorhead.

Congratulations, of course, to you, Roxana. During the time that you were in prison, did you have any sense at all how many people, including your family members, were working so very hard to get you out? What did you think were the results?

**Ms. Saberi:** I never wanted to be celebrated that way. I got hints, but it was after several weeks, and especially when my parents were able to come to Iran in early April and they saw me in prison. That is when they started telling me about the things that were happening and the different kinds of organizations and people in the country and across the world who were signing petitions and making calls for my release. I was very shocked to hear that, and I didn't know that I had created such a fuss.

It also was very complex because of the unusual situation like that. You are very alone and you feel very weak, and knowing that gave me a lot more strength, and I do feel now that I know a lot more.

But this award is an Award of Valor. I am so honored to get it, but I think that there are many more people that are

much more courageous than I, especially the men that I met in prison, who were there because they were expressing their basic human rights, and they are in prison today and there are more in Iran.

I would really like to dedicate this to them. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ford:** We honored you for your Courage, and I want to tell you it is people like you that make those of us in the business of journalism proud. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

## TODAY'S TOP VIII AWARDS

Now, it is my honor to introduce you to the final four of our 2010 Today's Top VIII Award recipients.

Basketball guard Kent Raymond's 2,308 points is the fourth-highest total in the history of the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin and the second-highest total ever for Wheaton College.

Only the third player in CCWI history to win the Most Outstanding Player Award three times, Kent was also named the 2008-09 D3 News Player of the Year and is a three-year National Association of Basketball Coaches' Division III first-team All-American.

Graduating magna cum laude with his undergraduate degree in communications and pursuing a graduate degree in intercultural studies while completing his eligibility, Kent was a two-time ESPN The Magazine Academic All-American.

A four-year softball starter for the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Brittany Rogers helped the school achieve 54 or more wins in every season of her career, the most over any four-year stretch in school history.

For all four years, Brittany was named an All-American by both the NFCA and Easton and became just the third player in Alabama history to earn all-SEC accolades for four consecutive seasons.

Sarah Stevens will go down in Arizona State University track performance history, scoring 101 career Pacific-10 championship points, the most in Arizona State University history; 98 career NCAA championship points, again the most in Arizona State University history and also top five in NCAA history; and earning 15 career All-American honors, the most in Arizona State University history.

Sarah was also the 2009 and 2007 U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association Women's West Region Outdoor Field Athlete of the Year.

A multiple-time All-American, University of Florida quarterback Tim Tebow is the first sophomore in history to win the Heisman Trophy and only the second player to repeat as a Maxwell Award winner for the collegiate player of the year.

In his legendary four seasons at Florida, Tim left an indelible mark in the record books and led his team to two BCS National Championships.

Boasting a 3.66 grade-point average as a family youth and community sciences major, Tim has twice been named the ESPN The Magazine Academic All-American of the Year.

Additionally, Tim has made an impact around the world with his community service efforts, giving back over 700 hours of his time this past year alone.

Let's take a closer look at this stellar group.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome our second group of Today's Top VIII winners. *(Applause)*

First, Kent Raymond. Presenting the award to Kent is Wheaton College president, Dr. Duane Litfin. *(Applause)*

Congratulations, Kent. I understand you are now playing in a European league. How did your college experience prepare you for the cultural experience that you have?

**Mr. Raymond:** I am playing in Europe, and during my time at Wheaton we had the opportunity to take a trip to Europe, and Wheaton played basketball in the community and played against some of the semi-pros there, as well. I think the really highest thing is the sport of NCAA basketball can go across cultural lines and can go across different backgrounds and allows us to form relationships, and that gives us the opportunity to live a much stronger life after that.

**Mr. Ford:** Great opportunities for you and our congratulations on your award. Good luck to you.

**Mr. Raymond:** Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ford:** Now, please welcome Brittany Rogers. Presenting the award to Brittany is Mal Moore, the director of athletics at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. *(Applause)* Congratulations.

**Ms. Rogers:** Thank you.

**Mr. Ford:** You talked in this paper about in the future being a coach. Why is that so important to you?

**Ms. Rogers:** Well, like I said, I have been an individual that has been offered to do this and to be educated. Like my parents said, you know, I am wearing the jersey, but I will be in charge of the kids every day. I am really excited about having the chance to teach them of the values that athletics has taught me that, you know, the education is just what it is, education, and that is the top priority today.

**Mr. Ford:** They will be very honored and pleased to have you as their teacher. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

Our next honoree is Sarah Stevens. Presenting the award to Sarah is Arizona State University Vice President for Uni-

versity Athletics Lisa Love. *(Applause)*

So, you talked about wanting to be a teacher and a coach, and that I am sure you marvel at being a teacher and a coach. What about athletics, are they over or do you plan to continue?

**Ms. Stevens:** They are certainly not over. I can be the coach and be training professionally, competing at the university. I can do that with the money, and trying to get the indoors-outdoor actually helped me teach that. I am going with that, and then it is a specific goal for 2012.

**Mr. Ford:** We will look for you in 2012. Congratulations. Good luck. *(Applause)*

And our final Top VIII winner is Tim Tebow.

Presenting the award to Tim is Jamie McCloskey, the University of Florida's senior associate athletics director. *(Applause)*

Tim, it is good to see you also. I have a question that most people would ask. You lived for years as a student-athlete under an extraordinary scrutiny and the public eye constantly. Were you able to have a regular college experience?

**Mr. Tebow:** I don't know if this is a regular college experience, but it surely was a blessing. My college experience was a little different than most people. It was special. I had an opportunity to be around people that I heard about, and an opportunity to be around people now, and I've got my brothers and coach that, like my dad, was truly a blessing.

So many people ask you how do you stay grounded? The one thing for me is my faith. If you know where you come from and have a relationship with Jesus Christ, you can do anything in your life that you want. That is the most important thing for me.

I realize that some athletes in today's society, they want to talk about their religion and their responsibilities and obligations. I think that athletes' responsibilities and their obligations are to use their whole model faith as the younger boys are looking up to us. I am also thankful for the faith and the reputation that is set forth for the boys and girls that are looking up to us.

**Mr. Ford:** You have had a special experience with all watching you, and the lights are on you tonight. Tim, congratulations. *(Applause)*

## INSPIRATION AWARD

We move now to our first Inspiration Award of the evening.

The Inspiration Award is reserved for incredible people who, when confronted with a life-changing event, use their determination and perseverance to overcome that obstacle and, in the process, serve as role models to others.

Tonight, we are proud to honor a remarkable group of individuals who have lived up to that standard.

Early on March 2, 2007, a bus carrying the members of the Bluffton University baseball team fell off an overpass onto Interstate 75 in Atlanta, killing five players, the bus driver and his wife.

Several of the surviving players and coaches received life-threatening injuries. Fewer than 30 days later, the team returned to the field of play against a league opponent.

While the team lost that particular game, the five runs Bluffton scored were a poignant symbol of each of the teammates they had lost.

Through a combination of spirit, determination and a desire to make something positive from this experience, each surviving member of the team went on to finish the season and worked toward completing their academic careers, exemplifying the highest ideals of the NCAA student-athlete.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming, from Bluffton University, coach James Grandey and 2007 team member Cody McPherson. *(Applause)*

Presenting this Inspiration Award tonight is Dr. James Harder, the president of Bluffton University. *(Applause)*

Coach, again let me ask you, knowing these boys as you did, did it surprise you at all that they wanted to and even needed to be back on the field playing?

**Mr. Grandey:** Absolutely not. It was a team, and I knew that they were great players. They had lost two of their teammates, not only their teammates but part of their family in the players they lost. They did well and to honor our fallen brothers and sisters made us be a part of that great group.

**Mr. Ford:** Cody, it has been characterized that you became one of the leaders of that team that helped the team get through this grieving process. How did all of that in your role in this tragedy impact on your own plans for your own future?

**Mr. McPherson:** Well, I think it is important to realize that the teachers are prophetic. You look for today and not tomorrow. Today is a gift from God, and I have thanked him. I begin every day with those thoughts.

**Mr. Ford:** Thank you, coach, and your entire team here this evening. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

That concludes the first half of tonight's awards presentation. We will take a short break for dinner and then continue with the awards. After the program concludes, as I mentioned, we invite you to dessert in the foyer.

After the presentation program concludes, you will have an opportunity to meet all the honorees. You can take photographs. I ask you please, however, no autographs. Other than that they will be glad to chat with you.

To kick off the dinner, please welcome back the Morehouse band. *(Applause)*

Enjoy your dinner.

*(Whereupon, the dinner is served at this time.)*

**Mr. Ray:** Please welcome back your master of ceremonies. *(Applause)*

## **INSPIRATION AWARD**

**Mr. Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, thank you. I hope you have enjoyed this evening so far.

We want to continue with our presentation, and we will start with our second 2010 Inspiration Award recipient, Lieutenant Colonel Gregory D. Gadson.

Lieutenant Colonel Gadson has been an athlete and a leader his entire life. As an athlete, he was a four-year football letterman at Army and anchored a defensive unit that led Army to a 9-3 record his senior year, which included wins over the Air Force and Navy, and a trip to the Sun Bowl.

In addition, Lieutenant Colonel Gadson has led soldiers in combat in Iraq, Afghanistan and Bosnia, making an indelible impact in each theater of operations, and receiving awards including three Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, a Meritorious Service Medal and the Army Commendation Medal.

In Iraq, on the evening of May 7, 2007, Lieutenant Colonel Gadson's vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device.

Lieutenant Colonel Gadson came close to dying that night, losing nearly 70 pints of blood, and eventually had to have both of his legs amputated above the knee.

In the years since, Lieutenant Colonel Gadson has worked tirelessly on his own recovery and has made it his mission to speak to athletes and students about perseverance, about faith and about forgiveness.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in congratulating our NCAA Inspiration honoree, Lieutenant Colonel Gregory D. Gadson.

*(Whereupon, a prolonged standing ovation was given to Lieutenant Colonel Gadson at this time.)*

Presenting the award to Lieutenant Colonel Gadson is Lieutenant General Buster Hagenbeck, superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. *(Applause)*

You talk about coming full circle in your life and you talk about the importance of coming back, coming back to college and coming back to West Point. What is it that you think you can bring back with you?

**Lt. Col. Gadson:** You know, the sport, it is more than a sport. I think every coach, every player out there realizes that they teach you life's lessons. The sport is service and has gotten into some tough times. All the lessons and attributes that I have spoken about sports really are significant in my life. It is so easy to come back and let these guys know that what they are doing is so much bigger than they realized. They have a chance to do something well beyond working hard and giving it their all. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ford:** I have to tell you we refer to you as an honoree, but it is we who are honored by having you here this evening. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

## **SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARDS**

Earlier this evening we met the Today's Top VIII recipients and were moved by their energy, their optimism and their excitement for the future.

Looking at them, you may have wondered what achievements lie ahead for them over the next 10 or 20 years. If the accomplishments of our next six award recipients are any indication, the Top VIII will go far.

Our next awards, the NCAA Silver Anniversary Awards, celebrate that potential brought to full bloom.

The award is given to former student-athletes on the 25th anniversary of the completion of their athletic eligibility.

Today's Silver Award recipients share several qualities: drive, empathy and compassion. Yet, they have achieved their notable success through their own unique and diverse paths.

Our first Silver Award honoree, Dr. Gregg K. Carr, was a four-year letterman as linebacker, consensus football All-American as a senior and an SEC Defensive MVP in 1984.

He was a three-time all-SEC selection and helped to lead Auburn University to a 29-8 record, three bowl victories and an SEC title in his last three seasons.

His post-collegiate career included playing four seasons in the NFL. He then moved seamlessly from experience in field injuries to repairing them, graduating from the University of Alabama at Birmingham School of Medicine in 1994.

He is president of Birmingham's Southern Orthopaedic Specialists, which he founded in 2001. His healing powers extend far beyond the four walls of the hospital. He is a member of the NFL Alumni Association's Caring for Kids program

and the Monday Morning Quarterback Club, which supports the Crippled Children's Foundation.

For Dr. Gregg Carr, success is no longer measured on a scoreboard, but on the faces of the men, women and children whose lives he touches every day.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, our first Silver Anniversary honoree, from Auburn University, Dr. Gregg K. Carr. *(Applause)*

Presenting Dr. Carr's award tonight is Auburn University director of athletics, Dr. Jay Jacobs. *(Applause)*

You played for the legendary coach and some legendary teams, and I know it is important in your life, some of the things that you learned from him in your career.

**Dr. Carr:** Sure. Coach (Pat) Dye was a tremendous influence on my life, and he had a tremendous impact on me. He instilled in me the importance of hard work and dedication and sacrifice. I think about him often because it really shapes my life. I think what I have done today could have never been done unless I had that inspiration. It has been a memorable ride for me, and I look forward to carrying that on down the road.

**Mr. Ford:** Thank you. Congratulations. I can say that we are all very proud of you. *(Applause)*

Our next Silver Award honoree is Jack Del Rio.

A four-year starter at linebacker at Southern California, where he graduated with a degree in public administration, Jack earned All-America honors as a 1984 senior and was a runner-up for the Lombardi Award.

He played in the 1982 Fiesta Bowl and was co-MVP of the 1985 Rose Bowl. Since graduating, he has spent 24 years in the NFL. As a player, he was drafted in the third round by the Saints in 1985 and was named to the NFL's all-rookie team.

He finished his career with 1,078 tackles, 12 sacks, 13 interceptions and more than 100 consecutive starts.

He is now in his 13th season coaching and in his seventh year as head coach of the Jacksonville Jaguars.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Unfortunately, Jack was not able to be with us in person tonight, but we were able to capture his thoughts about being an honoree on video.

**Mr. Del Rio:** I am sorry I can't be here to accept your award. I want you to know how much it means to be recognized and that my college career was tremendous. The doors were opened that I could never imagine, and I am very appreciative of this award. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ford:** Jack Del Rio, University of Southern California.

Our next honoree is Doug Flutie, who followed an outstanding collegiate athletic career with an equally impressive professional athletic career.

A 1984 Heisman Trophy winner, Doug graduated with a communications degree from Boston College, where he holds a school record in career yards, touchdowns in a game and yards in a game.

He led the college team to three bowl games, including a win in the Cotton Bowl.

He took part in one of the most memorable plays in sports history, throwing a Hail Mary pass to Gerard Phelan in the end zone as time expired to beat Miami, 47-45.

Doug enjoyed a prolific professional career that spanned 20 years in both the NFL and CFL.

He is the only player in Canadian Football League history to win four consecutive Most Outstanding Player of the Year awards, and he won the award an unprecedented six times.

He was an NFL Pro Bowler and Comeback Player of the Year while on the Buffalo Bills squad in 1999.

He was elected to the Canadian Football Hall of Fame and to Canada's Sports Hall of Fame, where he was the first non-Canadian inductee.

And in 2007, he was enshrined in the College Football Hall of Fame in his first year of eligibility.

Today he is president and co-founder of the Doug Flutie, Jr. Foundation for Autism, which raises money for education and research and aids financially disadvantaged families who need help caring for their children with autism.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, from Boston College, Doug Flutie. *(Applause)*

Presenting Doug's award tonight is Boston College Director of Athletics Gene DeFilippo. *(Applause)*

Of course, we have to talk about Doug Flutie. There are iconic moments and then there are the icons, the 25th anniversary of the play. Anybody who is any degree of sports fan has seen that play. What sort of impact do you think that one play for your great alma mater, Boston College, what impact do you think it had on the college?

**Mr. Flutie:** It was just from talking to the president of Boston College back then, and he said the disability we had through those years, and from that play and the recognition factor, he said, number one, applications went up the following year 20 percent. That is one year, and they continued to grow since.

And then to get into Boston College back then, you had to be competitive. When I went in, you probably had to be in the top 20 percent of the class. The following year you had to be in the top 10 percent of your class, and so on, and it has continued to grow to this day, and the academic standards are phenomenal at Boston College.

We graduate 96 percent of our athletes and are very proud of that. You know, it is just something that our group takes pride in in helping the academic standards of the university, as well as the football program.

**Mr. Ford:** That is a university play we will always remember. Congratulations, Doug. *(Applause)*

Our next honoree's list of achievements is so long that we literally don't have time to list them this evening, so here is the short version. Jackie Joyner-Kersey received a history degree from UCLA, where she was the record-holder for both the school and NCAA in the long jump and heptathlon.

In 1987, she was named the Sullivan Award winner as the nation's top amateur athlete. She has won six Olympic medals, the most of any U.S. track and field athlete, including two gold medals in the 1988 Olympics, both in the long jump and heptathlon.

She is the IAAF world outdoor record holder in heptathlon and the USA Track and Field American record holder in the long jump.

She was named Track and Field News World Athlete of the Year in 1986, 1987 and 1994. She has been inducted into the U.S. Track and Field Hall of Fame, the California Sports Hall of Fame and the UCLA Athletics Hall of Fame.

Sports Illustrated named her the Greatest Female Athlete of the 20th Century, and one of the NCAA's Top 100 Most Influential Student-Athletes for the centennial celebration in 2006.

And in spite of all of these enormous accolades, she holds one honor closest to her heart: founding and creating the Jackie Joyner-Kersey Youth Center Foundation in her hometown of East St. Louis, Illinois. *(Applause)*

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming from UCLA, Silver Honoree Jackie Joyner-Kersey.

Presenting Jackie's award tonight is Petrina Long, UCLA's senior associate athletics director and senior woman administrator. *(Applause)*

It would be difficult for most of us to imagine the work that is required to participate in one Olympic Games. What was it that said to you I need to be so successful, and how were you so successful, and you can participate in four Olympics?

**Ms. Joyner-Kersey:** Well, I didn't think about it at the time. But I think the most important thing for me was to always be a student, willing to learn from my coaches, willing to be a great disciplinarian, and just to stay on top of it. I had dreams, and I had goals, and a lot of people said you have done that. So, it is not just your dreams and goals.

So, I set that aside and that is what kept me on track.

**Mr. Ford:** You talk about a student, you were a teacher for so many young people as a role model. Congratulations.

**Ms. Joyner-Kersey:** Yes. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ford:** Our next honoree is Maureen O'Toole-Purcell.

Among her numerous accomplishments is the fact that she, almost single-handedly, carried women's water polo from its infancy in the United States to an Olympic medal sport.

Majoring in physical education at the University of Hawaii, Manoa, she was named NCAA All-American in swimming three times. She was voted the MVP of the United States Water Polo Championships a stunning 15 times. She went on to be named Sports Woman of the Year by the United States Olympic Committee four times, and has been a member of the United States National water polo team for 22 years.

At age 39, she was the oldest team member and the only team member over 30 at the 2000 Olympic Games where she captured a silver medal.

Today, in addition to a successful career as a coach and motivational speaker, Maureen is the founder of the Pursuit of Excellence Sports Academy, a nonprofit foundation that teaches self-esteem and leadership training in a sports environment for girls.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from the University of Hawaii, Maureen O'Toole-Purcell. *(Applause)*

Presenting Maureen's award tonight is Marilyn Moniz-Kaho'ohanohano, University of Hawaii, Manoa, associate athletics director and senior woman administrator. *(Applause)*

In college, you were a very good swimmer. You became a spectacular water polo player. Why did it change, and what did it involve in terms of shifting your athletics focus?

**Ms. O'Toole-Purcell:** Well, first of all, water polo is a swimming game, so being a swimmer really helped me to be successful in water polo.

**Mr. Ford:** It is sort of like rugby in the water.

**Ms. O'Toole-Purcell:** It is, but I will tell you standing up here I feel honored and privileged in seeing all the honorees up here, and I am not sure why I am up here. But what I would like to do is to thank the University of Hawaii and the whole NCAA for giving me the opportunity to be part of something great. I just felt that with all these people I have been crying all night. I hope I can make a difference in people's lives in athletics.

**Mr. Ford:** You have and believe me you belong up here. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

Our final Silver Anniversary honoree, Deb Richard, graduated from the University of Florida with a degree in advertising. While she was there, she was a four-year letter winner and led the women's golf team to its first national championship title in 1985.

She capped off her collegiate career by finishing second in the NCAA championships and received the Broderick award for golf. She was named to the all-SEC first team four times and is the only female golfer in the history of the league to win three SEC titles.

She racked up six career LPGA victories and many more top 10 finishes. In 1955, she founded the Deb Richard Foundation, which awards college scholarships to physically challenged children.

In addition, she created a leadership program that became the Soaring With Eagles Foundation.

She has been honored with the Golf Digest Founders Cup and the Sports Illustrated for Kids Good Sport Award. *(Applause)*

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Presenting the award tonight is Mimi Ryan, former head coach of the University of Florida's women's golf program. *(Applause)*

I wanted to see what happened. You have spent so much of your life mentoring people. I think the question I will ask is somebody as successful as you, did you have somebody out there that helped guide you in the direction your life would take?

**Ms. Richard:** It is interesting. I look at mentors as part of life. As mentors, you project this light for people to follow. I was really lucky that I had so many great mentors in my life, indelible knowledge of who I became, and I couldn't be here without that.

There were two incredible imprints on me, and it started the day I was born and 46 years later they still shine very brightly on my life. Mom and Dad, you are the greatest interest of my life because you are Mom and Dad. You have been great parents, and I love you very much for that.

But it is the lessons you taught, and you taught me leadership is the way to help, how you live every day including living with conviction and understanding what your core values are and knowing that they are the right thing. And that gets you through those crossroads of your life. Thank you so much for teaching me that because my life is a reflection of that.

So as you continue shining on me, it continues to shine through me, and then I project it now to the thousands of kids who will become a beacon of light.

**Mr. Ford:** I am sure they are so proud of you in the way you have pathed your own life. Thank you so much. *(Applause)*

## **AWARD OF VALOR**

We move now to our second 2010 Award of Valor recipient, Captain Richard Phillips. As a student, Richard Phillips played basketball at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, graduating with a degree in marine engineering.

Years later, he became captain of the merchant vessel Maersk Alabama, which was hijacked by pirates on April 8, 2009.

The 21-person crew was able to regain control of the ship, and to ensure his crew's safety, Captain Phillips surrendered himself to those pirates.

The pirates' plan was to transport Captain Phillips to Somalia, where they could hide him and make it difficult to stage a rescue. When it was determined that Captain Phillips' life was in immediate danger, U.S. Navy SEALs stepped in and successfully executed his rescue.

His crew says that their escape and survival were indeed a direct result of Captain Phillips' willingness to sacrifice himself by being taken as a hostage.

President Barack Obama said this to Captain Phillips: "I share the country's admiration for the bravery of Captain Phillips and his selfless concern for his crew. His courage is a model for all Americans."

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in congratulating Captain Richard Phillips.

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

Presenting the award to Captain Phillips is Bob Corradi, Massachusetts Maritime Academy athletics director. *(Applause)*

I think it is fair to say that not just only the nation but the whole world was captivated and mesmerized, and certainly all of us cheered relentlessly. I am wondering what is being done and what are you doing now to try to protect others from having to experience the same fate that you had to suffer?

**Captain Phillips:** Well, first, I would just like to say I accept this award on behalf of my crew of the Maersk Alabama for the fine job, and also my heroes, the U.S. military and the U.S. Navy, and the Navy SEALs in particular. On their behalf I accept this. *(Applause)*

To answer the question you asked, Jack, we merchant mariners around the seas have been fighting piracy and com-

bating piracy for centuries. It may be one of the second-oldest professions. *(Laughter)*

Today the mariners are all combating piracy in the Philippines, China, Indonesia, Morocco Straits, Nigeria, and also from my incident, too, in Somalia.

Since my incident, I have been able to speak with a few congressional committees and come up with some procedures for better protection for the ships.

Lastly, I would like to say that even today there are over 10 ships still being held hostage with over 200 people that are held hostage in Somalia today, and I think we need to correct that.

**Mr. Ford:** One of the things we see often is real heroes never think they are, but you indeed are that. Congratulations for all that you have done. *(Applause)*

## **THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD**

We come now to the final award presentation this evening, the Theodore Roosevelt Award. The "Teddy" Award is the highest honor the NCAA may confer on an individual.

To present this honor this evening, please welcome chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and president of Oregon State University, Ed Ray. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Ray:** Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is truly an honor to be in the company of such an exceptional group of people, and I am very pleased to present the final award of the evening, the "Teddy" Award.

Named after President Theodore Roosevelt, whose concern for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics led to the formation of the NCAA in 1906. This award is given to an individual "for whom competitive athletics in college and attention to physical well-being thereafter have been important factors in a distinguished career of national significance and achievement."

This is an apt description of this year's honoree.

George Mitchell was a competitive athlete during his undergraduate years at Bowdoin College, where he graduated with a degree in history. In college, he lettered in basketball for three seasons.

His political career took off in 1974, when he won the Democratic nomination for governor of Maine. He was appointed to the United States Senate in 1980, where he served with distinction for 14 years.

For six consecutive years, he was voted "the most respected member" by a bipartisan group of senior congressional aides. It seems to me we could use more like George Mitchell in Congress these days.

Time magazine named him one of the World's 100 Most Influential People.

For his contribution to help bring peace in his father's home country of Ireland, he has received numerous awards and honors, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor that the U.S. government can bestow.

Mitchell is currently serving as the American special envoy for Middle East peace for the Obama administration.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time.)*

Please join me in welcoming from Bowdoin College, Senator George J. Mitchell.

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

Presenting this award to Senator Mitchell this evening is Bowdoin College Director of Athletics Jeffrey Ward. *(Applause)*

## **REMARKS - THE HONORABLE GEORGE MITCHELL**

**Sen. Mitchell:** Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, for enduring a very long session. My gratitude to the NCAA and to Bowdoin College for this award, and I thank Bowdoin College for changing my life.

I would like to introduce three representatives of the college here today, including Jeff Dempsey. Please stand. They did make a big difference in my life. They are Scott Alnye who is a confidante. Important in my life is the family, and I am pleased to be joined here by my sister, Barbara, one of the greatest competitors I have ever met in my life. Barbara, please stand. And a great young scholar and budding athlete, my 12-year-old son, Andrew. Andrew, will you stand up and be recognized. *(Applause)*

I want to dedicate this award to my three older brothers who can't be here this evening. I want to explain why that is so. Before I entered the Senate, I had the great privilege of serving as a federal judge in our home state of Maine.

After I had been a judge for less than a year, one of Maine's senators, Ed Muskie, was appointed secretary of state by then President Carter, and there was a vacancy in the Senate. The governor of Maine was empowered to appoint an interim placement. And since the Senate was in session and debating, he didn't want to leave our state unrepresented for a long period of time. He said that he would hold a press conference the following Monday noon at the state capitol to announce his choice.

There was a great deal of speculation in the papers. He had a former senator, a former governor, a former congressman all of whom were well-qualified. My name was not mentioned, and it never occurred to me.

That Sunday evening I went to bed early, like everyone in Maine, wondering what the governor was going to do the

next day. At 11 o'clock that night, it was the governor on the phone. He said, "I would like to have you come down to the state capitol tomorrow so I can announce that I am going to appoint you to the Senate."

I said, "Gee, Governor, this is a really big decision." It was a big surprise. You know, federal judges are appointed for life; senators are not. And the record of appointed senators is not a very good one. I said, "I have got to think about this and talk to my family. I need some time to give it real consideration."

He said, "I will give you one hour. You have to call me by midnight."

So, I immediately called my brothers. We grew up in a small town of Waterboro, Maine, and my three older brothers were great athletes, really good athletes, and very well-known as a result of it. Then I came along, and I was not as good as my brothers. In fact, I was not as good as anybody else's brother. *(Laughter)*

So, very early in life I came to be known around town as Johnny Mitchell's kid brother, the one who isn't any good.

As you might expect, I developed a massive inferiority complex, and a highly competitive attitude toward my brothers.

So, on that evening, after the governor's call, I telephoned them, ostensibly to seek their advice. My real intent was to convey the triumph I had in my voice when I said, "The governor has just called me, and he wants to appoint me to the United States Senate. What do you guys think about that?" *(Laughter)*

Well, they first responded immediately negatively. My brother Johnny said, "Look, everybody knows you are a born loser. You couldn't possibly win a statewide election. We don't understand how you got to be a federal judge. We think you better stay where you are."

My other brother said the same thing in less colorful language. I was so mad, I hung up the phone and I called the governor and I said, "Governor, I don't need until midnight. I have already received all the reassurance I needed. I am qualified." So, I went down and I served in the Senate for nearly 15 years, and eventually becoming the Senate majority leader. I have done a lot of things since.

When I think about it, the high point in my life was the first election I had after I served out the remainder of Senator Muskie's term.

When I started, I was 36 percentage points behind in the polls. I was given no chance to win. And I was lucky, we ended up winning on the election night. As you know, in American politics there is a celebration in one hotel ballroom and a moving evening in which I happened to be at the ballroom like this filled with people cheering. My brother was all over me. He couldn't get away from the cameras.

The next day the local paper had a big picture captioned saying, "Senator Mitchell is celebrating his upset election victory, cheered on by his unidentified supporter." *(Laughter)*

The only condition I will impose upon the NCAA for accepting this award is that they make a video of it and send it to my brother Johnny.

The truth is that I was not a very good athlete. I think that this award is recognition of the fact that if you really try, you can succeed even though you may not be the best at what you are doing.

So, I accept this award with great gratitude of the NCAA and gratitude to both of my brothers.

I was 16 years old when I graduated from high school, insecure, uncertain, as naive as a 16-year-old human being could be. Bowdoin College changed my life in ways that have made a difference.

Next Monday, I will return to the Middle East in a continuing effort on behalf of the president and the people in the United States to bring peace, if we can, to a part of the world that has had devastating conflicts for many, many years.

As I do so, I will be inspired and sustained by the emotions I have received this evening, particularly being in the presence of really good athletes, but more importantly in the presence of great human beings.

It reminds us all how fortunate we are to be Americans, to be citizens of the most free, the most open and the most just society despite all of our many imperfections.

My mother was an immigrant. My father was an orphan, and they had no education. They had very little in the way of material resources. Because of them and because of the openness of American society, I, their son, was able to become the majority leader of the United States Senate, engaging in activities which they could not possibly have ever dreamed.

I have been asked many times in the past few months why would I undertake this assignment in this time of my life. The answer is really very simple. I regard it as a great honor to be asked to serve my country again. There is nothing more or less that we can ask. We have benefits and privileges, and with them come responsibilities.

As I watched and listened this evening, like Maureen, there were tears part of the time, and when I saw Lieutenant Colonel Gadson walking across the stage, I was reminded what it is to be an American.

Thank you all very much for this honor and for the many courtesies this evening. Thank you.

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

**Mr. Ford:** Thank you, President Ray, and also congratulations once again on this so well-deserved honor to Senator Mitchell and also to Bowdoin College.

And now I would like to invite all of tonight's honorees back to the stage for just a moment, please, and then we will say goodnight. As they come forward, tonight's winners represent outstanding achievement and the highest ideals.

Each of their stories is a reminder of what it means to be excellent academically, professionally and personally.

These award recipients have dramatically demonstrated the values that make up the foundation of the NCAA: learning, balance, spirit, community, fair play and character.

They are truly the best of the best. That is why we are so very proud to honor them all this evening.

So, as the honorees parade out into the foyer, please join me in one final round of applause for our 2010 Honors Award recipients.

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

Now, you will have the opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, as we wrap up this evening, once again we invite you to join all our honorees out in the foyer. On behalf of the NCAA, we thank you all for joining us tonight.

*(Whereupon, the Honors Dinner was duly adjourned at 8:30 p.m.)*

## Division I Business Session

### Friday, January 15, 2010

*(The Division I business session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Marriott Marquis Hotel, in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 15, 2010, was called to order at 3 p.m., with Board of Directors chair James Barker, president of Clemson University, presiding.)*

**Mr. Barker:** Good afternoon. My name is Jim Barker. I serve as president of Clemson University and chair of the Division I Board of Directors.

I am glad to see such a good turnout here this afternoon. We have some important business to conduct at this session, and I would like to start this business portion of the meeting with just a few preliminaries.

We have on the stage with us today Damon Evans, who is director of athletics at the University of Georgia and chair of the Division I Leadership Council. Raise your hand.

Also, Joe D'Antonio, senior associate commissioner of the Big East Conference and chair of the Legislative Council.

In addition, we have David Berst, Jackie Campbell, Steve Mallonee, is that correct?

**Steve Mallonee (NCAA staff):** You have got it.

**Mr. Barker:** I am told I am the only one that has ever pronounced that correctly. And also Lynn Holzman. All the folks are from the NCAA staff with us.

Delegates, you will need to have with you an electronic keypad to vote during this business session, which you should have received as you entered this room.

During the registration, a smart card was provided to each voting delegate. Please note that proxy votes are not permitted. Only those people who have been designated by their president as the institutional staff member may cast votes, and they must be present to do so.

You do not need to turn on the keypad because it works whether you turn it on or not. It is on. You should simply insert your smart card up to the red line. A welcome message will appear, and when it is time for you to vote on the motion, I will declare that the polls are open. At that time you should press the appropriate button to register your institutional or your conference vote. You will press "1" for yes, "2" for no and "3" to abstain.

Your choice will appear in the window on the front of the keypad. The keypad will accept votes until I declare that the polls are closed. So, if you press the wrong button, simply enter the correct vote before the polling stops, and the cast vote will be registered.

I will wait briefly during the vote before I close the polls, so time should not be an issue. After the polling is stopped, we will pause while the results of the electronic tally are displayed. Please note this is the only Business Session for Division I.

Finally, at the conclusion of this Business Session, please remember to leave the keypads and the Smart cards at your seat. If you happen to take the keypad with you, please return it to any NCAA staff member. We will find you.

To be certain that the keypads are performing correctly, let's conduct a test vote. Anyone having a problem should go to the computer table for assistance. Let's vote on the following question: Are you wearing an orange tie today? All right. We will go to an orange shoe.

Assuming no discussion, the polls are open and you should press "1" for yes, "2" for no or "3" to abstain. I declare that the polls are closed.

Are the results displayed? If you encounter a problem in voting, please report to a computer work station for assistance. It looks like we may have at least one problem.

In a moment, I will recognize any delegate who wishes to offer the base motion to override the Legislative Council's action with regard to Proposal No. 2008-46. Following the second to the motion, I will open discussion of the motion and call on delegates who will approach the microphone to speak. The speakers should identify themselves by their name and their institution or other affiliation.

Once the chair is satisfied that the discussion has concluded and that no new information concerning the matter at issue is being presented, I will announce it is time to vote.

Please remember that a "yes" vote will support the motion to override the legislation and a "no" vote will support the Legislative Council's action to adopt the proposal.

A successful override will require five-eighths majority or 62.50 percent of the "yes" votes among the total of "yes" and "no" votes of delegates present and voting.

The Division I institutional and multi-sport conference members that qualify to vote in the Governance Structure are eligible to cast a vote.

I will begin the formal business in just a moment.

So, if you intend to make a motion to override Proposal No. 2008-46, all participating discussion of the motion, please

begin to take a position near the microphones at this time.

Are there any questions? Now, I would like to call the Division I 2010 business session to order. I will first consider a motion to override the Legislative Council's adoption of Proposal No. 2008-46, which essentially expands the playing season in baseball by one week.

I will recognize anyone at the microphones.

Microphone No. 5, please.

**Robin Harris (Ivy League):** I am Robin Harris with the Ivy League. I move the override.

**Mr. Barker:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Carol Iwaoka (Big Ten Conference):** I am Carol Iwaoka with the Big Ten Conference. I second the motion.

**Mr. Barker:** We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, it appears we are ready to vote. Please note that we are voting on the motion to override the Legislative Council's action to adopt the Proposal No. 2008-46.

**Matthew Baysinger (Big 12 Conference):** Yes.

**Mr. Barker:** For discussion, I will allow that.

**Mr. Baysinger:** Thank you, President Barker. With your permission, can I please turn around and face the audience?

**Mr. Barker:** Yes.

**Mr. Baysinger:** Thank you. Good afternoon. I am Matt Baysinger, currently the chair of the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I stand here today not only representing my institution and conference, but also the 160,000 student-athletes of the NCAA Division I.

On behalf of these student-athletes, I urge you all to oppose the override of Proposal No. 2008-46.

Over the last three years, the NCAA membership has made great strides to increase the graduation rate, APR scores and overall well-being of baseball student-athletes.

During the NCAA Convention last year in Washington, D.C., the Division I Legislative Council under your guidance adopted Proposal No. 2008-46 for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, it is important to note that this proposal affects the length of the season and not the number of dates of competition.

With this in mind, increasing the length of the season from 13 weeks to 14 weeks will allow for more scheduling flexibility, ultimately leading to less missed class time for baseball student-athletes in both the southern and northern regions.

Further, a longer championship season without the addition of more games allows for more rest and recovery for baseball student-athletes, which would alleviate the physical pull and mental strain of playing a large amount of games in a small amount of time.

This is particularly important to the health and safety of teams with limited pitching staffs or small rosters. Proponents of this override will say that a longer season will put cold-weather schools at a competitive disadvantage as they may not have the ability to practice outside.

However, the intent of Proposal No. 2008-46 addresses an issue which is far greater than geographic inequity. This proposal was created to ensure that baseball student-athletes have the opportunity to make academics their first priority.

On behalf of the 160,000 Division I student-athletes that I am called to represent, I encourage you to make a long-term commitment to academics and student-athlete well-being by opposing the override of Proposal No. 2008-46. Thank you for your time.

**Mr. Barker:** Is there further discussion?

Hearing none, the polls are now open. Please push "1" to vote yes for the override; push "2" to vote no and support the legislation; or push "3" to abstain from expressing a position.

The polls are now closed. The override is defeated.

We now consider a motion to override the Legislative Council's adoption of Proposal No. 2008-59, which places sand volleyball on the list of emerging sports. I will recognize a motion and a second at this time.

Microphone No. 7, please.

**Ms. Iwaoka:** I am Carol Iwaoka, Big Ten Conference. I move the override of Proposal No. 2008-59.

**Mr. Barker:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Kyle Kallander (Big South Conference):** I am Kyle Kallander, Big South Conference. I second the motion.

**Mr. Barker:** Thank you. Is there any discussion?

Microphone No. 8, please.

**Jill Bodensteiner (University of Notre Dame):** Good afternoon. My name is Jill Bodensteiner. I am the associate athletic director for compliance and legal affairs at the University of Notre Dame. I am here to share with you a very narrow approach to the decision on sand volleyball. Notre Dame will vote in opposition because we strongly support sand

volleyball as an emerging sport.

Let me say Notre Dame's approach to this decision is to look at this as an intercollegiate athletic issue and not a Notre Dame issue.

I realize there are several factors to consider, for example, the cold weather, and if any of you have been to South Bend, Indiana, there are obviously several details to resolve when it comes to incorporation of sand volleyball.

In addition, I understand that there is a viewpoint out there that sand volleyball could hurt the court game. You might ask yourself why Notre Dame, being a northern Upper Midwest school, is in favor of sand volleyball as an emerging sport. In fact, our athletic director and our SWA and our head volleyball coach are all unanimously in favor of sand volleyball.

We looked at several factors. Number one, we looked at the wild popularity of sand volleyball even in the Upper Midwest. I can't find a women's basketball league to join in South Bend, Indiana, but I could play sand volleyball every week in our limited summer. It is the West Coast of Michigan, and certainly wildly popular in Chicago.

We look at the gender equity opportunities. I know having crunched Notre Dame's gender numbers for the past 12 years, there are folks who say this is going to have a huge impact on the number of participants.

Let's think beyond the numbers. I certainly don't think it is going to harm the numbers and look more broadly at the opportunity for growth in young women. Sand volleyball is a pipeline to a very popular professional league and a pipeline to the Olympics.

We are looking at the gender issue more broadly than just the bean counters who happen to be Title IX numbers.

Thirdly, we look at the experience that our teams had. They had phenomenal experience last spring when they participated in the sand volleyball tournament in Florida. They had the opportunity to learn these skills, push themselves with practice in March indoor on a regular court and a little bit of outdoor time permitting, and the students got to go to the tournament.

Again, we ask you to step back from the minutia and look at it from a broader intercollegiate athletic opportunity to capitalize on a wild and popular sport. I urge you to join us in voting in opposition to the override.

**Mr. Barker:** Microphone No. 7.

**Joel Maturi (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities):** I am Joel Maturi, director of athletics at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, and a member of the Big Ten Conference. Like you, I have listened and read much about those who favor adding this sport of sand volleyball, and obviously those that are opposed.

I think that many times that this verbiage is the same. We are talking about adding opportunities. We are talking about quality experiences for our young student-athletes. We are talking about our commitment to Title IX. We also talk about the responsibility that we have, the fiscal responsibility.

In reality, although we are well-meaning intended, we come to an emotional disagreement. There are four points I would like to make. I personally wonder whether we are going to add any real new opportunities for young women if we add a sport of sand volleyball.

I strongly believe that we are going to compensate student-athletes two times. It is hard for me to fathom that somebody who is a talented young woman, who participates in sand volleyball is not also a very outstanding court volleyball player.

We talk about the aspect that we don't have to add it if we don't want to add it. Again, that sounds good. We are fortunate at the University of Minnesota to have a pretty talented volleyball program. The reality of it is if this is added by our competition, we believe we are going to be forced to add it because we are going to be recruiting the elite student-athletes whom we anticipate playing both sports.

I don't like to use the verbiage haves and have-nots, but if you think there is a deprivation today between those that have some wherewithal and what will happen in the future, that will only be expanded to greater recruiting budgets and additional staff members, and obviously the student-athletes that will be recruited.

I would like to say further what is the cost? What is the cost that will be added? Quite frankly, I don't know. I don't know where I would add an indoor court on our campus, let alone an outdoor court at the University of Minnesota.

What will the expense be for that? I remember being in this body three years ago when we would have spent less money if we had OK'd the additional scholarship that was proposed at that time, which definitely would have provided new opportunities, at least one for each Division I institution, but we didn't pass that because of the cost legislation and the cost concerns.

I do believe that we may have made a mistake, that those would have been real opportunities.

Finally, I am concerned about our student-athlete welfare and, quite frankly, our staff's welfare. Volleyball is a long sport season. It begins in August, and if they make it to the championships, you don't end until mid-December. That is a long season.

Not only is it stressful, you know, for them, but stressful on their bodies, as well. It is not an easy sport to play.

I think the same thing is true of their travel, their commitment and the challenges that they have academically

because of it. And if we are to add that to a spring championship sports season, as well, I would be concerned for the welfare of our student-athletes and, quite frankly, for the coaches who coach the sport. Thank you.

**Mr. Barker:** Microphone No. 5.

**Cheryl Levick (Georgia State University):** I am Cheryl Levick, athletic director at Georgia State University. I urge you to vote "no" on the override of sand volleyball. At Georgia State University, due to student interest, we are adding football next fall, and we are also adding several other sports.

As you know, there is the equity study to see what the interest of the schools is in adding to women's sports. We did that and found a very strong interest in adding sand volleyball. We also found a very strong recreational interest in sand volleyball, which means we can tie sand volleyball to our recreational area and offseason on campus to play volleyball in addition to have a competitive sport of sand volleyball.

There is one problem. We do need to have this voted in as an emerging sport. We are not voting today as a varsity sport, but to let it be added to the list of emerging sports so that we can choose, you can choose whether you want it or not.

So, the focus really is about access and fairness. It is really legislation to added opportunity to female sports. So, in my mind it should be an easy vote.

We are really always trying to look for other opportunities for our student-athletes to make sure that we are in compliance, but also what do we really want to do? The young kids are playing court and sand volleyball year round. So, that is not going to change. We just want to be able to add an opportunity on a college campus for these kids to come and play year round.

As the former chair of the Committee on Women's Athletics, I believe we have worked hard for as many emerging sports as possible.

There are a lot of emerging sports that let you choose which ones you want to add on your campus. They are not mandated. You can choose which one, and then once that emerging sport is approved, then, of course, you still need 40 to have any kind of championship. We are talking and voting about access of opportunities, not about adding a championship today or tomorrow.

I close by really asking all of you what is best for volleyball? Let's not let short-term worries about recruiting to kick here and there, but this is an opportunity that is a long-term investment added for women who want to play. They want to play it with or without it. I think we should take a leadership role and add sand volleyball. I ask you to vote "no" on the override.

**Mr. Barker:** Microphone No. 3.

**Danielle Neault (Big West Conference):** Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Danielle Neault, and I serve on the Executive Board of the Division I National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I stand before you today representing all Division I student-athletes.

I encourage you to join the national staff in opposing the override of Proposal No. 2008-59. It is time for you to know that I am here today as a female student-athlete because of a landmark decision made in 1972, when Congress passed Title IX.

Over the last 38 years, more than a million female student-athletes have had the opportunity to participate at the Division I level because of Title IX and the cultural changes it has and continues to bring about.

National staff believes that the membership should keep sand volleyball as a Division I emerging sport. The sport has been gaining attention and exposure since its adoption at the 1996 Olympic Games here in Atlanta.

In fact, sand volleyball was recently adopted by Division II as an emerging sport. This sport will provide many young women the opportunities to compete, receive financial aid, strive for Division I national championships while receiving a good education. The opportunities to compete have been a long-standing priority of our committee.

Because of the impact the economy has had on intercollegiate athletics, the Division I staff recently shared a document with the membership that outlines our financial priorities in an attempt to preserve the student-athlete experience. The opportunities to compete remain among the top of our priorities.

I cannot put into words how valuable my Division I intercollegiate athletics experience has been to me, both on the field and most importantly in the classroom. We believe the opportunity to compete is essential to the student-athlete experience.

While the sport may not grow as rapidly as anticipated due to the current economic times, the economy will eventually improve, and we must plan for the future. Your actions today can fulfill the dreams of many young women in the years to come.

I would like to remind you that you are not voting on the proposed plan and practice season or the financial aid, but rather you have the opportunity to give thousands of female student-athletes a chance to play a Division I sport. The national staff urges you to join us in opposing the override, thus providing opportunities for many female student-

athletes. Thank you.

**Mr. Barker:** Microphone No. 6.

**Connie Dillon (University of Oklahoma):** Good afternoon. I am Connie Dillon, and I am faculty athletics representative from the University of Oklahoma, and I am here to speak in support of the override.

I remember my first Convention was in 2006, and I remember thinking I will never stand in front of this microphone and talk to this group was my first thought. My second recollection of that meeting was the discussion of increasing scholarship opportunities in women's sports, and I am bringing that up because I think in terms of opportunities as broader than just the opportunity to compete because in order to compete you have to have the opportunity to go to school. I appreciate the interest of our staff and the comments made by that group. I support 100 percent the idea of opportunities for women.

My own daughter has benefited from an opportunity I did not have for Title IX. I would like to have an opportunity that is broader than just the opportunity to play, but also the opportunity to go to school.

I remember in that meeting that the only sport I believe that was sponsored by the college in which the scholarship opportunities for recruiting was supported -- that the SAAC was the only group that spoke out in favor of those opportunities for soccer and that did sway, I believe, possibly the staff recommendations in a way that swayed the membership on that issue by their passionate speech pleas.

I would like to suggest that my concern with sand volleyball from the beginning is really threefold. The first is the fact that the number of opportunities are small compared to the cost that we will be spending to have that sport. I think we would have many more opportunities if we put those costs into something like expanding scholarship opportunities, particularly for some sports such as gymnastics and track and field, which carries so much of the burden of our cost management for so many of us.

The second thing is as I look, and being on the Championships Cabinet, I studied the impact on schools, and for student-athletes it really increases the amount of time that they will be spending in both playing and practice throughout the year, even into the summer. So, there are some student-athletes that will be participating in practice season and playing into the finals in the summer.

It will cross over into finals week in both December for indoor volleyball, and for quarter systems into March for sand volleyball, and for student-athletes in the championships into May and on into June.

I guess the final thing I would like to say in terms of sand volleyball, understand I am a faculty member and I have been on the Championships Cabinet for a couple of years, and I have had a lot to learn about emerging sports. I know in our discussions of these issues we talk about both with respect to emerging sports and endangered sports, that we need to examine the process for doing this.

I know we will be working with the Committee on Women's Athletics to look at the process of how an emerging sport should happen in a way that perhaps where we can do a better job in terms of finding the emerging sports, getting the criteria that will go by and through the center.

Those are my three points: the cost issue, the impact on academics, the cost benefits with respect to other costs, giving them an opportunity when compared to putting the money and give more opportunities through scholarships, and finally the issues related to the cost factor. Thank you.

**Mr. Barker:** Microphone No. 5.

**Marilee Hill:** I am here to speak to a "no" vote on the override. I would like to make two points. While I was on the Committee on Women's Athletics, we sponsored the sport of bowling as an emerging sport, and I can tell you there was a general snicker in this audience when we suggested it.

It was a sport that really had a diverse participation. It was a sport that really pushed some limits that we had all decided were really athletics, and I think that we all learned a great deal from it because it has become a very popular sport.

Volleyball, sand volleyball is a popular sport. Women are playing the sport. Why did we ever sit here and deny the opportunity? Let it grow or let it fail, but let it have an opportunity.

I also come from an institution that doesn't support court volleyball, but I am interested in adding sand volleyball without adding court volleyball. I give you that as another alternative. Thank you.

**Mr. Barker:** Microphone No. 1.

**Wright Waters (Sun Belt Conference):** Thank you. I am Wright Waters, Sun Belt Conference. Just a little bit of a history lesson, and I think if we don't learn from history we are subject to repeat it. About 30 years ago this Convention, some crafted it as a merger, others crafted it as a takeover, but the NCAA and the AIAW merged.

The overriding theme throughout that entire discussion 30 years ago was that this Association would continue to explore to find opportunities for women. Folks, this is not a vote on the competitiveness. This is only a vote on opportunity. We urge you to vote "no" to the override.

**Mr. Barker:** Microphone No. 6, please.

**Stan Williamson (Campbell University):** My name is Stan Williamson. I am director of athletics at Campbell University, and currently vice chair of the Committee on Women's Athletics.

On a personal note, I am a parent of a volleyball student-athlete. You can imagine by looking at me, she is not 6-4, and she does not have a long arm span, wingspan. She does have general skills for volleyball and could play sand volleyball at a much higher level than inside volleyball. That is just a point on a personal note.

Smaller, general skills, volleyball student-athletes can have an opportunity to play more competitive sand volleyball than she might inside volleyball. I am here to represent the Committee on Women's Athletics, and to kind of go over what happens with a Committee on Women's Athletics.

They are charged with the emerging sport process. It was developed in 1990 to provide opportunities for growth of women and to expand sports scholarship opportunities for member institutions.

A number of sports have gone through that process, some are still on that list. Some have gone from that list to a full NCAA championship opportunity. Those include rowing, water polo, ice hockey and bowling.

The CWA looked at this for a period of over two years, along with the American Volleyball Coaches Association and many other people and institutions, which included support letters from a dozen presidents and athletics directors from our membership.

What we learned was that sand volleyball far exceeds any other sports that we have discussed as far as interest and participation. In fact, sand volleyball had more than three million participants and added 293,000 overall from 2007 to 2008.

Female participants under the age of 19 are now at 240,000 as of 2008. Sixty-four percent of those female sand volleyball participants report playing only the sand game and not indoor volleyball. It would be unfortunate to see a sport so popular with young women be denied an emerging sport status because of that interest.

This is really the point of an emerging sport process. Again, no school is forced to add this. In fact, in this economy it is unlikely that a lot of schools will. However, there is interest here, and schools will only add it if it fits their mission purpose, their fan and student interest, and certainly budget constraints.

An emerging sport is just that, one that hopefully provides new opportunities, but one that will only become an NCAA championship if indeed there is that much interest.

This is an exploratory process, and that is not talking about championships at this point. Again, this is a vote that should not be about individual institutions. This should only be a vote about providing the viable sport opportunity for our member institutions that potentially can grow and flourish into a solid NCAA championship for young women. I strongly support the defeat of this override.

**Mr. Barker:** It appears that we have one more.

Microphone No. 4.

**Kathy DeBoer (American Volleyball Coaches Association):** My name is Kathy DeBoer. I am the executive director of the American Volleyball Coaches Association. I also would like to talk to you just a little bit about where we have come from in looking at where we are going to go.

I was playing intercollegiate athletics when 60 percent of women were crossover athletes. Volleyball players played basketball. When I listen to the arguments that we make about why should we not put this sport on the emerging sports list, I think if that would have been the argument we could have made in adding every single women's sport, we would never have added them.

I sat, not as the executive director but as the incoming director of the AVCA, five years ago in this room when the 13th scholarship, that had been voted in by the Legislative Council and by the Board of Directors, for women's volleyball was defeated.

It was defeated because people said no, no, we don't want to just put more scholarships into the same sport, we want to put more scholarships into new sports. So, we have a very inconvenient fact in the sport of volleyball right now. That is sand volleyball is very popular. We have never had an emerging sport that is played by a lot of people that play our current sport and others that don't that may be as popular or more popular than the current sport.

So, what do we do with this? Some of the things that we have said to each other about this issue, and let me give you some. This is what I hear. This is what I have heard from you in the last 18 months on this issue. "I am really for sand volleyball. I think it is a great sport, but I don't have any money to add a new sport right now, so I am going to support killing it."

"I think sand volleyball is fabulous. I watched like every single one of the Olympic Games. You know, we don't have enough good athletes in court volleyball right now, so I am going to support the override."

"Oh, I love sand volleyball, I think it is a great game, but we don't have weather so we will not be able to add it, so I am going to support the override."

Or my favorite, "We are at compliance with Title IX. We don't need to add any more women's sports, so I am going to

support killing one.”

One of the reasons that I get to stand in front of you today, I am the executive director of a 5,000-member coaching association, and there is not one single sand volleyball coach in my association. But my last five presidents, Joseph Sagula from North Carolina, Bonnie Kenny from Delaware, Mary Wise from Florida, Beth Launiere at Utah, Ray Bechard at Kansas, have all said for the good and growth of the development of our sport, of opportunities for people to play our sports at the college level, at the high school level, at the club level, support sand volleyball, Kathy. Make the argument that this be added, and all five of them have heard from their administrations we will not be adding a team.

I am so proud of that leadership. I am not standing here in front of you telling you that I have 5,000 coaches that support sand volleyball. My association is the same as yours and the same as your institutions. If you tell volleyball coaches to form a firing squad, they make a circle.

There is a lot of dissension among our ranks, but as you have heard from others, this is about opportunity. This is about access. This is about answering what women say they want to play. So, are we going to be about what we say we are about, or are we going to be about what we are accused of being about? Are we going to be about education, access and opportunity, or are we going to be self-interested? Please vote “no” on this override. Thank you.

**Mr. Barker:** It appears we are ready to vote. Please note that we are voting on the motion to override the Legislative Council’s action to adopt Proposal No. 2008-59.

The polls are now open. Push “1” to vote yes to override the legislation. Push “2” to vote no and support the legislation, or push “3” to abstain from its present position.

The polls are closed.

The override is unsuccessful.

Is there any other business to come before us today? Please remember to leave your smart cards and keypads at your seat.

Is there a motion to adjourn? I have heard several motions to adjourn. We are adjourned.

*(Whereupon, the meeting duly adjourned at 3:45 p.m.)*



## Division II Business Session

### Saturday, January 16, 2010

*(The Division II business session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Annual Convention held on Saturday, January 16, 2010, in the Marriott Marquis, in Atlanta, Georgia, was called to order at 8 a.m., with chair Stephen Jordan, president of the Metropolitan State College of Denver, presiding.)*

**Mr. Jordan:** Good morning. I'm Stephen Jordan, president of Metropolitan State College of Denver, and chair of the Division II Presidents Council. The 2010 Division II business session will come to order.

As we begin this session, I think it would be appropriate for us to take a moment to share our thoughts with our fellow colleagues from Lynn University who, today, still have three of their colleagues missing in Haiti.

I also think it is appropriate that we give a moment to our colleagues at the University of Southern Indiana who, on Thursday night, had a basketball player collapse on the court and subsequently pass away.

If we could take a moment of silence, please.

Thank you.

Well, here we are, the business session. We've got some important business in front of us. I simply want to remind all the delegates of two of our Division II attributes: passion and respect. Today we encourage your passion at the microphone, and we expect respect for all the delegates and what they have to say.

As we begin today's annual meeting, I would like to ask the Division II Student Athlete Advisory Committee to stand and be recognized.

I know we all agree that this is a truly remarkable group of talented student athletes who represent the best and brightest in Division II. They play an active and important role in our legislative debate today, and you will hear them speak in a little while.

My purpose in taking a moment to introduce them now is to highlight the work they do for our division throughout the year in bringing positive attention to our strategic positioning and attributes. I am obviously talking about their grassroots fundraising effort for the Make A Wish Foundation that has now surpassed more than \$1.1 million.

This effort has helped to make this campaign the Make A Wish Foundation's largest grassroots group in the world. Congratulations to you, to the SAAC, for your leadership and vision for student athletes everywhere.

I am convinced that this group and our nearly 100,000 student athletes are, indeed, our greatest resource. That is why we have produced a new Division II public service announcement through the voice of the student athlete. Let's take a look.  
*(Playing of video clip.)*

**Mr. Jordan:** As we begin today's business session, I would like for the other officers of the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council to stand and be recognized as I introduce you.

Presidents Council vice chair Beverley Pitts, president, University of Indianapolis; Management Council chair Tim Selgo, director of athletics at Grand Valley State University, representing the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Management Council vice chair Butch Raymond, commissioner of the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference.

I would also like to take this opportunity to introduce Paul Engelman, faculty athletics representative, University of Central Missouri, who will serve as our Division II parliamentarian.

Additionally, members of the Division II governance staff and the academic and membership affairs staff are with us today. They are here to assist us with legislative questions and issues that may come up during the course of this year's business session. Thank you all for being here.

As is required by our NCAA constitution, we would like to take a few minutes to catch the membership up on the events of the past year and to discuss some future priorities. So I present to you Beverley Pitts, president of the University of Indianapolis and vice chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

Beverley.

**Beverley Pitts (University of Indianapolis):** Thank you, Steve.

As we begin today's business session, we would certainly like to share with you some of the areas of interest to the division in the last year. Most of you got this, I hope you all got this, our Division II yearbook. If you have not gotten it, be sure to pick one up. One of the big advantages of it is it's something we can take back to our campuses.

The yearbook contains important committee reports and information about Division II, and perhaps even more importantly, it assists us in conducting our business session more efficiently by providing you written documents about our committee reports, instead of committee speeches.

It also provides you with important news that you can share with your campuses and conferences, and I encourage you to do that. I would like to take just a couple of minutes to highlight some of the information that's included in the yearbook. It begins with a review of each Division II committee's highlights and actions for the year.

You'll also find an updated Division II Facts and Figures document that I think you will find very useful throughout the year.

Also, the News and Notes section provides information about several special events taking place and awards that were bestowed upon the Division II membership in 2009.

On Pages 34 and 35 you'll find a listing of the Division II persons who have accepted new positions on committees or have just completed their term of office. If you know anyone who has completed a term of office, I encourage you to thank them for their service to the division.

The division's priorities for 2010 are listed on Pages 36 and 37.

Following this listing, you'll find a listing of the various NCAA and Division II programs that provide financial assistance and/or professional development opportunities for our membership.

Very specifically this year, Dr. Myles Brand is honored and remembered in the yearbook. I know you'll want to take a careful look at that.

Division II's involvement with Make A Wish, as we just talked about, makes us all so very proud, and it's also in the yearbook.

The remainder of the book focuses on various Division II championships in 2009. I hope the yearbook continues to be a useful tool for all of you for the coming year.

This year in particular, our Division II governance intern, Carl Segura, presented a yearbook for us that is probably the best ever. So thank you, Carl.

A second item of interest that I'd like to talk with you about is our Division II strategic plan. We've all been engaged with this for some time, and it's time for a quick update.

You'll probably remember the strategic plan was launched at the 2009 Convention and is in effect until 2012. The plan is comprised of five goals. Each of the goals comes with several associated priorities. In addition, each priority has been assigned to one or more of the oversight groups or governance entities to ensure that they are being carried out.

Last year, the Division II Planning and Finance Committee was appointed to monitor the strategic plan and assess the report and its implementation. As part of this responsibility, the Planning and Finance Committee wants to give you a quick walk through the five goals of the strategic plan and share with you briefly just some examples of the work and oversight that has already begun in these very early stages.

Goal One relates to academics and life skills. It stresses the importance of promoting and honoring student athletes' success, protecting student athlete well-being, developing positive attitudes through contributions to the community, providing opportunities for student athletes to have an active role in the governance process, and fostering partnerships to enhance the success of both student athletes and the student body.

To carry out one of the priorities associated with Goal 1, which is to provide and honor academic measures of success and retention, the Academic Requirements Committee has developed a template language that can be used by institutions and conferences when communicating the academic success of their student athletes with local media. It's just one example of the kinds of things we'll see over the next couple of years, as all the committees develop the priorities and the actions that will align with this strategic plan.

Goal Two relates to athletics operations and compliance. This goal emphasizes presidential commitment and involvement, leadership and professional development opportunities for athletics personnel, coaches and faculty, and commits conferences and institutions to effective compliance programs.

One of the priorities for this goal is to involve, enhance and recognize the role of athletics administrators, coaches and faculty in the governance process. To carry out this priority at the national level, the Nominating Committee has committed to ensuring that committee composition includes a diverse makeup representing all of these areas.

Goal Three is associated with game day and conference and national championships. It emphasizes the need to promote and enhance a quality student athlete experience in Division II athletic competition and conference and national championships, and to ensure game environments are competitive, safe, positive, respectful and entertaining.

Goal Four is related to membership and positioning initiatives. It supports a commitment to fiscal responsibility, to the allocation of athletic funds and resources, consistent with the identity of Division II.

Additionally, Goal Four emphasizes the importance of attracting and retaining members who support Division II.

One of the priorities of this goal is to attract and retain members that support the strategic position and the philosophy of Division II intercollegiate athletics. The oversight of this priority has been assigned to the Membership Committee. Toward that end, the committee has been working on a set of minimum requirements that institutions seeking to become members of Division II should demonstrate in order to be invited to enter the membership process.

Finally, Goal Five is diversity and inclusion. It supports the importance, value, benefits and role of diversity and inclusion in higher education and in intercollegiate athletics.

Although these are just a few examples of how far we've come, you can see the strategic plan is already in full motion, and it is the expectation of the Planning and Finance Committee that this document will continue to guide us as we move forward as a division.

The Planning and Finance Committee will keep the Division II membership aware of the strategic plan implementation

through several methods, including articles in NCAA News, updates on the Division II home page and annual reports at the convention.

A special thanks to all of you for your contributions to making this strategic plan a very good working document. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Thank you, Beverley, for your report.

Obviously, a lot of good work has been done in Division II. Perhaps the most important task at the moment is to emphasize the value of the Division II athletics model. We offer a fiscally responsible approach. We provide an intersection where athletically gifted student athletes can compete at a high level. And we are committed to an environment where we emphasize graduation and a total collegiate experience for student athletes.

This is the energy in Division II, and we must continue to tell this story to all who are willing to listen.

Thanks again to Bev for your leadership and your service.

We need to take just a few minutes to review the voting processes we will use in Division II at the NCAA Convention.

Some votes will be done by paddle vote. Some proposals are designated for roll call, where we will use the voting units. Let me remind you how to cast a vote using these particular voting units.

All voting delegates should have a voting unit and a smart card. The smart card should be inserted into the unit, noting the direction of the arrows, until you reach the red line on the card. When the card is inserted correctly, a welcome message will appear. When it is time to conduct a roll call vote, either press the number 1 for “yes” or the number 2 for “no” on your keypad. It is very important that if you do not wish to vote on a proposal, you press the number 3 on your keypad to abstain. When you abstain, your institution will be noted as present, but not voting.

Check your response in the display screen on your keypad. There is no “Enter” key required. If you want to change your vote, use the “C” key to clear and enter the new vote. The last number you press prior to the voting window closing will be your registered vote.

Your keypad does not have to be pointed in any particular direction in order for your vote to be received. The radio waves will continue to bounce around the room until they find the receiver. A little bit like what we do on campus, right?

You will be allowed approximately 30 seconds to cast your vote. Once discussion on a particular proposal is completed, I will say, “It is now time to decide. Please cast your vote by pressing the number 1 button for ‘yes,’ the number 2 button for ‘no’ or the number 3 button to abstain. We will then wait approximately 30 seconds to say, “The polls will close in five seconds.” Any votes cast after I say, “The polls are now closed,” will not be received.

Please note that we have six representatives actually, I think five representatives -- from our Division II Membership Committee available to assist you if you have any problems with your voting units. I encourage you to find these people if you need assistance.

I would like for the voting helpers to please stand as I call your name. Dave Brunk, Peach Belt Conference; Joan McDermott, Metropolitan State College of Denver; Karen Stromme, University of Minnesota Duluth; Kim Pate, Brevard College; and Sandy Michael, Holy Family University.

We also have Jim Watson, West Liberty University, who is seated in the voting pit to my left. Jim, if you would stand, as well. Jim will work with the voting technicians to assist if there are technical issues that need to be resolved.

In addition, Glenn Stokes, Columbus State University, and chair of the Division II Membership Committee, can assist with voting equipment issues if you experience any problems. Glenn, will you stand, as well.

Those are the members of your Voting Committee this year, so please find someone if you are experiencing any problems with your voting unit or smart card.

Like in previous years, we are using the large video screens to project voting information. Voting results will be provided immediately for all electronic roll call votes. We will display the roll call vote results on the large screens and make an announcement regarding the vote tally after we close the polls and before we proceed to the next proposal.

At the end of the business session, please make sure you leave your voting units and smart cards on the table. The staff will collect them there.

Before we start our official voting, we need to conduct a couple of test votes to ensure that your voting units are, indeed, working properly.

If you have not done so, please find your voting unit and insert your smart card into the voting unit. I'll give you a couple seconds to do that.

For the first test vote, please press the number 1 or the “yes” button on your voting unit. Please press the “yes” button now so that we can confirm that your voting unit is working.

In early 2007, leaders in Division II began discussions on the game environment in Division II. From those early discussions, came a pledge commitment by 100 percent of the presidents and chancellors in Division II to work together to make respectful family friendly events a standard of the Division II experience.

We all knew that this was just the beginning of this initiative. An interactive website was developed for Division II members

to begin sharing their game environment success stories and the Division II story. We created an annual Division II Game Environment Award of Excellence that would, first of all, recognize the best game environment initiative from each Division II conference, and from there, select one overall national winner who would be recognized at the Convention.

Well, the time has arrived, and I'm happy to announce that the University of West Florida has been selected as the first Division II National Game Environment Award of Excellence winner for its initiative titled, "Argonaut Spirit Challenge."

**Judith Bense (University of West Florida):** Thank you. I'm here with our athletics director, Dave Scott, to accept this wonderful award, this inaugural award.

The Argonaut Spirit Challenge is a promotion that awards student populations on campus with prizes for the group that shows the most school spirit over a span of six basketball double headers.

It increased our attendance at the University of West Florida by 175 spectators a game. Each game had a specific theme: superhero, white out, Mardi Gras, things like that.

I want to thank you and introduce our folks that dreamed this up and developed it, Tony Nguyen, who is here, and graduate student Ian Waldron. If you'll stand up. Thank you. It was their idea. They developed it. They implemented it, and they won.

This promotion is an example of what the University of West Florida is doing to promote game environment on our campus. I've been to these games. You can't have a decent conversation with the person sitting next to you because the students are all too rowdy. They're worrying about themselves. They're worrying about winning. They're worried about how loud they can yell. It was a big change in our environment. I think it was a great idea.

The University of West Florida is committed to athletics and our student athletes. Athletics is the front porch of our university. We thank you very much.

**Mr. Jordan:** The first test vote was successful, so we're ready for our second test. For the second vote, please press the number 2 or the "no" button on your voting unit so we can confirm that it works. Please press number 2 or the "no" button now.

Also, in tandem with our strategic-positioning process, is our community engagement initiative. For the fourth year, and at the 2010 Presidents and Chancellors Summit, we will be awarding a National Community Engagement Award of Excellence. Deadline for submission will be Friday, April 23. We have information concerning the award and application process at our Division II information booth located here on the marquee level by the elevators, and also on the Division II community engagement website at [DIIcommunity.org](http://DIIcommunity.org).

At this time, we would like to show you the video that highlights the 2009 Community Engagement Award of Excellence winner, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, whose winning entry is titled, "Paint the Town Gold."

*(Playing of video clip.)*

**Mr. Jordan:** The second test vote was good.

As a reminder, Robert's Rules of Order provides the procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice.

In addition, you will find in your Official Notice, several appendixes in the blue pages that list procedural information that may be of assistance to you. You should each have received one of these (*indicating*).

NCAA procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, and to expedite our work as delegates.

I will not take time to explain all the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout our business session this morning.

There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently, and let me briefly review those.

As stated, we will use the voting machines for roll call votes. All other votes will be handled by paddles. Roll call votes were designated by the Presidents Council for those proposals where it is important to create a historical record of how each Division II school and conference voted on the issue.

I will attempt to eyeball as many paddle votes as possible, calling for a machine count only when the vote appears to be too close to call. Although the delegates have a right to call for it, I ask delegates to refrain from calling for a machine vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of an issue.

If a delegate intends to debate an issue during the business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks.

The microphone numbers will be used to recognize speakers. Delegates will be limited to speak to a single motion no more than twice.

If I see no one at the microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible.

The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in the NCAA legislation and are summarized in Appendix H, which is located on Page No. 89 of your Official Notice.

I would ask that you identify yourself by name and your institution or affiliation whenever you address the Convention.

Those delegates wearing Convention lanyards that are red, blue or green are permitted to speak. Those with other colors are visitors and may not participate, other than as observers.

As a reminder, the speeches made during today's business session for each proposal create a historical record that becomes important for research regarding the legislative intent of the 2010 voting delegates. The annual Convention proceedings will serve as the official record of the business session, and your remarks will be included in these proceedings.

Let me also briefly review the window of reconsideration opportunity. After we complete the consideration of the 14 Division II proposals this morning, we will pause for approximately two minutes for people to organize for a period of reconsideration. I will call for a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that have been voted on. We will verify that the motion maker did vote on the prevailing side during our initial debate. We ask that all motions to reconsider occur during this window of reconsideration.

Also, please note that some proposals have immediate effective dates upon implementation. For such proposals, the immediate effective date must be considered first, followed by a vote on the merits of the proposal.

If an immediate effective date is defeated, and the proposal is adopted, the effective date will then be August 1, 2010.

We have a court reporter here today to prepare a transcript of this business session. So I again remind you to identify yourself and your institution or affiliation whenever you speak.

The 2010 NCAA Convention Official Notice, which you should have received in November, includes all of the legislation pertinent to today's business session. So again, this is the notice (*indicating*).

In Appendix A, the blue pages in the Official Notice, Pages 49 to 50, you'll find a list and the order of the 14 legislative proposals that will be considered during this Division II business session.

I would also like to call your attention to the procedural issues memo, the green sheet which I pointed to earlier (*indicating*), handed out this morning. This memo highlights the procedural issues related to the division's legislative proposals.

We will attempt to complete our business this morning. We will complete our business this morning, yes. But in the unlikely event that we have not completed our voting this morning, we will recess around 12:30 for lunch, which will be box lunches that will be located at the marquee foyer just outside this ballroom. Please return from lunch by 1 p.m. if we need to continue an afternoon session for any reason. We hope that will not be necessary.

Our first business item this morning is to approve the Official Notice format. If we vote to accept the Official Notice, we will vote on the proposals in the order in which they appear in the notice.

I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, you will have approved the noncontroversial legislation in Appendix B, Pages 51 to 73, and the intent based amendments in Appendix C, Pages 75 to 76.

These amendments have all been approved by the Management Council during the past 12 months, and we will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so.

I will now ask for someone to make a motion to adopt the Official Notice and the printed order of proposals so that we may proceed with our work. After such a motion, we can then consider any motions to reorder proposals. Do I have such a motion? Is there a second?

It has been moved and seconded, and it is now time for our paddle vote on the motion to adopt the Official Notice and printed order of proposals. All in favor, please raise your paddles; all opposed, please raise your paddles; abstentions. Thank you. The motion is adopted.

This year the Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposals 1 through 4 as the consent package, and they are intended to be voted on as a group.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposals Nos. 5 through 8 as those that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chancellors and presidents, and has included them in the Presidents Council Life in the Balance package this year.

After considering the Presidents Council grouping, we will then consider the rest of the legislation, beginning with Proposal No. 9 and continuing until we finish with Proposal No. 14.

We are now ready to begin our consideration of legislative proposals. We will start on Page No. 1 of the Official Notice with the consent package, Proposal Nos. 1 through 4.

As we begin, I would like to remind you to please state your name and institution or affiliation for the record when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones.

Proposal Nos. 1 through 4 are the consent package, and they will be considered as a group unless there is an objection. This is a paddle vote. The Management Council and Presidents Council have determined these proposals to be generally housekeeping in nature, and that's why they have been placed in the consent package.

Proposal Nos. 1 and 3 have immediate effective dates. However, since they are part of the consent package, there will be

no separate vote on the effective date for these two proposals unless someone moves to pull the particular proposal from the grouping.

Microphone No. 6.

**Tim Selgo (Grand Valley State University):** Tim Selgo, director of athletics, Grand Valley State University, and chair of the Division II Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal Nos. 2010 1 through 2010 4 as the consent package.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded. Is there discussion?

**Mr. Selgo:** Each of these proposals was placed in the consent package because of the nature of the change being proposed. Each of these four proposals is considered without controversy. Therefore, it is appropriate to vote on all four as a package.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there any further discussion?

It is now time for our paddle vote on the consent package, which is Proposal Nos. 1 through 4. All in favor, please raise your paddles; all opposed, please raise your paddles; abstentions. The motion carries.

We are now ready to look at Proposal Nos. 5 through 8. These proposals make up this year's Life in the Balance package.

Proposal No. 5 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010. However, contracts signed before August 6, 2009, for contests or dates of competition occurring between August 26, 2010, and September 1, 2010, may be honored. There is also an amendment to amendment, Proposal No. 5 1, prepared by the Northeast 10 Conference, that will be considered by roll call vote.

Please refer to Page No. 18 in the Official Notice where you will find the amendment for field hockey, which would delay the effective date of the reduction of the maximum number of contests in that sport until August 1, 2011.

Microphone No. 4.

**Joseph Grunenwald (Clarion University of Pennsylvania):** My name is Joseph Grunenwald, president of Clarion University, and a member of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and the Division II Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, with the support of the Management Council, the Championships Committee and the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 2010 5.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Grunenwald:** At the 2009 NCAA Convention, Division II presidents and chancellors discussed a number of issues confronting the membership. One of those issues was the length of playing seasons and the maximum number of practices and games permitted each year. At that time, and today, presidents and chancellors believe that the playing season model in Division II is not in alignment with the division's strategic-positioning platform, which calls for balance in our student athletes' lives.

A starting point for creating better balance is to amend the fall sports season. Proposal No. 2010 5 pushes back the start date by one week for the first contest in the fall to the Thursday preceding September 6. This means that the fall sports student athletes will not be required to report for preseason practice until a week later in the summer.

This change will likely give time back to the student athletes in the summer to continue working and spend additional time with family and friends. In addition, institutions will not bear the increased cost of bringing student athletes back to the campus so much earlier than the general student body.

Proposal No. 2010 5 calls for a reduction in the maximum number of contests in field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball. Field hockey and soccer will be reduced from 20 to 18 contests, and women's volleyball will be reduced from 28 to 26 dates of competition.

Presidents and chancellors agree that this change is prudent since these sports do not move their championship to a later date, which results in the playing season being shortened by one week. Balance would again be difficult to obtain if teams were required to squeeze in the same number of contests as in previous years, in a shortened season.

The changes to the fall sports season set forth in Proposal No. 2010 5 are the right thing to do. Looking at the big picture, these are minimal changes. Without this strategic step forward, institutions may have no choice but to begin eliminating entire sports programs.

Not only is Proposal No. 2010 5 putting the legislation in alignment with the division's positioning platform, which focuses on Life in the Balance, but it also meets one of the seven core values of the association, which calls for balancing academic, social and athletic experiences for student athletes.

Now is the time to make a change for the betterment of our student athletes. I strongly encourage you to join me in support of Proposal No. 2010 5.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 5.

**Julie Ruppert (Northeast 10 Conference):** Thank you. My name is Julie Ruppert, commissioner of the Northeast 10 Conference. On behalf of the Northeast 10, I move Proposal No. 2010 5 1.

**Mr. Jordan:** It has been moved and seconded.

**Ms. Ruppert (Northeast 10 Conference):** Thank you.

Just 24 institutions in Division II sponsor the sport of field hockey. Those sponsoring institutions believe that there has been an unintended consequence regarding the impact of Proposal No. 2010 5 on this particular sport next fall.

The 2010 national championship game will take place on December 4, in conjunction with the division's Championships Festival in Louisville. This is three weeks later than the traditional field hockey championship game, which normally occurs the second Sunday in November. Due to this change, the championship segment is, in fact, 13 weeks in length next season.

By all accounts, the original intent of the contest reduction within this Life in the Balance package was to account for a shorter championship segment, but the 2010 field hockey season will, in fact, be two weeks longer.

Delaying the effective date for the reduction to the maximum number of contests is in the best interests of this sport and its student athletes. As the previous speaker noted, the rationale behind the contest reduction is that balance would be difficult to attain if teams were required to squeeze in the same number of contests in a shortened season. Field hockey does not have a shortened season next year. The proposed 18 contest maximum would not allow for the consistent scheduling of two games per week, the average number of contests that these student athletes play currently.

This change affects only the 24 institutions sponsoring field hockey in Division II, and it's important to know that it does not affect the proposed first practice or contest date contained within Proposal No. 2010 5. It seeks only a one year delay in the effective date for the reduction in the maximum number of contests in the sport of field hockey.

Please join us in support of Proposal No. 2010 5 1.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Diana Kling (Peach Belt Conference):** My name is Diana Kling from the Peach Belt Conference. On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I encourage you to vote in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 5 1.

This amendment to amendment will delay the effective date of the reduction to the maximum number of contests in field hockey by one year. The sponsor notes that this delay is necessary to account for an extended playing seasoning in the 2010 2011 academic year because of the Division II Fall Championships Festival.

The championships festivals are a defining feature of Division II, which distinguishes our championships experience from the other divisions. The membership understands that the sports that conclude their season in the festival format, historically have their playing seasons adjusted. Institutions and teams are willing to adjust their playing seasons to account for their opportunity to participate in such an exciting event.

Delaying the effective date for the reduction of the maximum number of contests in field hockey is unfair and inequitable to the other fall sports.

If Proposal No. 2010 5 is adopted, all fall sports will be required to make adjustments to the championship segment of the season. Field hockey should be treated no differently than other sports facing the challenge of adjusting their fall championship season during a festival year. As such, we should leave the original proposal intact, and vote on Proposal No. 2010 5 without including the amendment to amendment.

For all the reasons previously stated, please join me in opposing this amendment to amendment, Proposal No. 2010 5 1.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6, is this on the 2010 5 1?

**From the Floor:** Yes, Dr. Jordan. No, I'm sorry, it's on 2010 5 only.

**Mr. Jordan:** On 2010 5, only. OK.

Microphone No. 5.

**Brendan Sullivan (Stonehill College):** 5 1. Thank you, President Jordan. My name is Mr. Brendan Sullivan. I'm the director of athletics at Stonehill College, and I stand before you to ask your support for 2010 5 1.

Delaying the effective date for the reduction in the number of contests in field hockey is neither unfair nor inequitable to the other fall sports. The opportunity to participate in the championships festivals should not come at the expense of the regular season. In 2010, without the passage of this amendment, this is exactly what will happen to field hockey, but not the other sports participating in the festival.

Men's and women's soccer and volleyball will conduct their national championship games on the exact corresponding date as in 2009. The cross country championship will occur later than its traditional date, but cross country has had no proposed reduction in its number of contests.

The notion that all fall sports will be required to make adjustments to their championship segment if 2010 5 is adopted may be true in that the length of the playing season is one week shorter for soccer and volleyball; however, no other team sport is being impacted because of the championships festival. These changes are because of the potential passage of 2010 5 that will result in the shorter playing season for soccer and volleyball in 2010.

It is the reduction in the length of the playing season that led to the proposed reduction in contests. There simply are no adjustments being made for soccer and volleyball due solely to the presence of Division II's ongoing commitment to its championships festival.

Field hockey should be afforded the same opportunity, and should not have its season affected by this festival alone. It is important to note that in prior fall festival years, teams were able to have a lengthened playing and practice season by permissibly being able to report back a week earlier in order to maintain the same number of maximum contests. 2010 should be no different in allowing for these adjustments.

For these reasons, I urge your support for delaying the effective date by one year and supporting this amendment to amendment.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Jeff Michaels (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania):** Good morning. My name is Jeff Michaels. I'm the acting director of athletics at Shippensburg University and a member of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference. I urge your support in the passage of 2010 5 1.

We reiterate that the 24 institutions that sponsor the sport of field hockey are not looking to adjust the dates of the playing season, nor are these schools looking for an opening in the Life in the Balance package. What we are asking for is to ensure that field hockey student athletes are afforded the same pattern of competitions that their counterparts in volleyball and soccer are given.

We continue to hear and read that contest reductions were not arbitrarily determined, and that they are a product of the length of the championship season being reduced by one week. Again, given that the 2010 field hockey season will be extended by two weeks this coming fall, reducing the maximum number of games in the year where the season is not shortened, but, in fact, lengthened, is contrary to the spirit in which the Life in the Balance initiative was developed.

If we are to allow these institutions with field hockey programs to determine the appropriate contest numbers for next fall by passing this amendment, the 24 institutions can permissibly determine if they want to play 20 contests over the 11 week regular season. In subsequent years when the national championship returns to the traditional mid-November date, the playing seasoning is reduced, and the 18-game maximum is fair. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Lauren Silva (Northeast 10 Conference):** Good morning. My name is Lauren Silva, and I am a student athlete in the Northeast 10 Conference. As a student athlete in the sport of field hockey, I urge your support of Proposal No. 2010 5 1.

As a field hockey player, the rhythm of participating in two games per week is what we prepare for, both physically and mentally. This pattern of two games per week has provided a balance between practice and game opportunities.

Without passage of this amendment, the 24 field hockey programs may see periods during the season where there is only one game in a 10 day period. As an athlete, we utilize the preseason to physically prepare for our schedule and develop and hone our skills.

Some have said that the field hockey programs could choose to come back even later than the proposed changes, in order to preserve the normal two game per-week schedule during the regular season. However, we believe this to be unfair to these student athletes who should be afforded the same conditioning and bonding opportunities prior to classes beginning in the fall.

By approving this amendment, you allow the institutions with field hockey to do what is in the best interests of their student athletes. Seventy-five percent of the field hockey programs will not make the NCAA postseason tournament and the championships festival. Those programs deserve an opportunity to schedule, at their discretion, 20 games between September 2 and November 21, which will be the NCAA championship selection date in 2010.

I urge your support for 2010 5 1. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Sharon Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania):** Sharon Taylor, director of athletics at Lock Haven University.

Other speakers have certainly been better prepared and more articulate in addressing this issue. I really didn't intend to get up on it. It doesn't affect us at this point.

But field hockey has had a tortured history in the NCAA. We had a program. We had a championship. We didn't have a championship. A championship was reinstated. It now affects only 24 institutions in Division II.

This change, what maybe hasn't come across is that while soccer and volleyball will play on several weekends leading up to the festival, field hockey is always resolved on a single weekend. So the season is played, and then there's one weekend where the hockey championship occurs and the champions are determined.

This has been a very serious impact on these schools that are trying to maintain this wonderful sport. I know there are some other schools in this room that are considering this. The last time we had this discussion, as I look around the room, some of you were probably in elementary school. But there were some of us that were here. At that time, Division II was playing in Division III. The impact was that Division II had to assume the scholarship limits of Division III, but it had to assume the playing limitations which were in Division II. It was a very unfair situation for those Division II institutions.

We were able to resolve that because people were understanding of it, and the NCAA made a change so that they could play and compete in the competitive division, they could use both the scholarship limits and the playing limitations.

This is a similar situation. It's a one time request. And I really hope that the institutions that don't sponsor this wonderful sport, will if you can't support it, please don't oppose it. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there further discussion on Proposal No. 5 1? If not, we will now conduct a roll call vote on the amendment to amendment, Proposal No. 5 1, using your voting units.

It is now time to decide Proposal No. 5 1. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 button to vote "no," or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 5 1 is adopted.

Microphone No. 6.

**Kelly Higgins (Fort Lewis College):** Thank you, Dr. Jordan. Kelly Higgins, athletics director, Fort Lewis College. I wish to, before I start, state the names of Kyle Wood and Tom Settle on that screen right behind Dr. Jordan, proud members of the Fort Lewis College national championship men's soccer team.

Colleagues, I think many of you know I really don't want to be here at this mike, but I must. Good people with good intentions are attempting to implement change that, I believe, will have dire consequences.

I am absolutely opposed to Bylaws 5, 6, 7 and 8. What is this package? A close look tells me, really, it's not about Life in the Balance. It's really political good looks and competitive equity.

We all know the facts. I'm not going to talk much about facts here. I've written about that ad nauseam for some of you, and too much for others.

I see this strictly as implementing specific mandated game in the season reductions that actually discriminate by region, sport and geography. Why?

The Division II philosophy statement, which was so eloquently stated before, as the basis upon this, already requires each of us, each of us, to advocate for student athlete welfare. It is my job responsibility now. It is all of yours. Our job responsibilities to our school or state also require us to be fiscally responsible. I am responsible fiscally to my president and the state board of trustees. So are you.

We already have the ability to choose these options not to play. We have the options right now to choose to enhance student athlete welfare on our own campuses, in our own conference.

So that leaves me with one choice of saying, "What is this?" I see this only as competitive equity or keeping up with the Joneses.

The political ease of this is that it's very easy for me to say publicly that we cut the number of games for all during difficult times. And this, I must confess, is a very enticing option. But it's wrong.

It's as wrong as what I also firmly believe has been some inappropriate, to an extent, advocacy on behalf of this proposal at times and places. I don't think it's appropriate. To the point that the advocacy at some places and some times almost feels like coercion. I know it's not. These are good people, trying to enhance their cause. But I think it's inappropriate.

In my opinion, we need to limit change in ways that increase opportunity to meet these constitutional requirements. I urge you to don't put on blinders and concern yourself only with the sections of these packages that affect your school now. A change in one can and will create change in others now or in the future in ways you do not want. Do not feel compelled to vote for the bad just to get the good. There is much good in this, much good.

What is better? Choice. You all have the ability to choose these options now. One change I've proposed, and others have, as well, is to reduce the number of mandated Division II competitions in each sport, so we have more choice to reduce if you believe it's necessary and you have to do so. It's been done before. It still supports the Division II's first philosophy, yet recognizes options for regional and sport demographic and geographic issues, specifically out West, and specifically, as previously stated, in sports such as field hockey. It allows those options to be addressed.

Think globally, not locally. Vote "no" on all these. Or, as I've tried to state many times, I would certainly urge a friendly amendment to unpackage each and every one of these bylaws so you vote sport by sport, bylaw by bylaw, which is what I've been used to most of my career, 20 plus years in the NCAA.

I don't see this as cohesive. It does not address real student athlete issues of season creep. In fact, we're going to be voting on something to potentially allow more opportunities in the summer with these seasons I'm talking I can't the rental thing on the summer thing. That is not what I'm thinking about here.

Create options. Do not take them away. Acknowledge geographic sport diversity. Don't squash it. Do not reverse simplification, deregulation. This is an unwarranted and unneeded complication. It is philosophically unsound. It is restrictive at a time we need more options, not fewer, to succeed.

I urge all of you, again, vote "no." Get it right first. Get involved in this process. Create more choice, not less. Bring back a cohesive package that addresses the issues, and vote on them one by one. Don't take this as a take it or leave it politically, well designed package. And it's beautifully designed. I think it's great.

We can address balance and still let the people play the game. That's what everybody wants to do. They don't come to watch the kids play at practice. The student athletes don't come to practice. They come to play. That's the balance. Let's play the game. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Julia Beeman (Belmont Abbey College):** Julia Beeman, Belmont Abbey College, and a member of the FARA Division II Legislative Review Committee. On behalf of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I stand in support of Proposal No. 2010 5.

This proposal is consistent with the Division II strategic platform and the Life in the Balance philosophy. These changes are likely to benefit student athletes by reducing missed class time, missed study time and time away from campus, thereby encouraging participation in other campus extracurricular activities. Please join FARA in support of Proposal No. 2010 5. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Rosemary Broderick (Great Lakes Valley Conference):** Good morning. My name is Rose Broderick from the Great Lakes Valley Conference, and I am a member of the National Student Athlete Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

The Division II SAAC recognizes the merits of Proposal No. 5, and the commitment of the Division II Presidents Council to aligning the playing and practice season legislation with the strategic-positioning platform. During the 2009 10 academic year, the Division II Presidents Council has shared the vision of a Life in the Balance for all Division II student athletes. This vision is more than just balance between academic pursuits and athletics. It is an opportunity for all Division II student athletes to fully engage in all aspects of campus life.

This proposal would decrease the length of the fall playing season and push back the start date for preseason practice by one week. Student athletes would be able to spend an additional week at home with their families, studying abroad, attending summer classes or working. In addition, the later start date will decrease the chance of preseason burnout.

Student athletes recognize that the later start date will also have an economic benefit to the institution since we will arrive on campus one week later. We would rather sacrifice one week of preseason, than face the prospect of sports being cut altogether.

The reduction of games in the sports of field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball would allow student athletes to spend more time on campus and have less missed class time. However, student athletes want to compete as much as they can during the four years they are part of a college athletics team.

This proposal is a move toward a more balanced campus life and would allow us to develop a more well rounded focus. We are concerned that additional reductions will occur and further erode our opportunity to compete, break records and train in the sport we love.

We have great respect for the presidents and our athletic administrators and are proud of the strides we have made thus far, and are looking forward to the future of Division II.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Drew Bogner (Molloy College):** I'm Drew Bogner, Molloy College, East Coast Conference and member of the Presidents Council.

As higher education institutions, we do not exist in a societal vacuum but are expected to represent and accomplish our essential and central task of education.

On January 7, the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics officially announced its support of the Life in the Balance package we're considering in Division II. The Knight Commission has been very influential in the success and appropriate positioning of intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of higher education for the past 20 years. It is very important for our member institutions to understand that they have written a strong statement of support for these legislative proposals.

I'd ask that I could read today their statement of support during this debate because I believe it is important to make this part of the official record that is being kept of this business session.

The following statement was issued by co chairmen of the Knight Commission, William E. "Brit" Kirwan, chancellor of the University System of Maryland, and R. Gerald Turner, president of Southern Methodist University. This is the statement from the Knight Commission.

"We commend the Division II presidents for their leadership in developing the comprehensive Life in the Balance initiatives to better align policies and practices with Division II philosophy.

"In the recent recognition of its 20th anniversary, the Knight Commission noted that presidential control and leadership in intercollegiate athletics continued to be at the heart of the commission's approach. The presidential led Life in the Balance package being considered by Division II reflects the commission's view that presidents should be involved in assuring that all aspects of university life are considered in NCAA policies.

"The commission has been concerned about the increasing time demands placed on athletes by their athletic commit-

ments, in all NCAA divisions, particularly in light of recent research on these issues. The commission commends and supports the Division II presidents for putting these issues on their agenda, both on their own campuses and through their NCAA structure."

I think it's important for us as colleagues to understand that this has been a very inclusive process. It is true that the stimulus for these discussions centering around the concept of Life in the Balance, began with chancellors and presidents who attended last year's Convention. And from that time forward, these issues were brought into the various committees and legislative bodies of NCAA Division II.

These proposals and policy reviews of Phase 1 have been a part of the most inclusive and exhaustive review conducted by the membership since it became federated in 1997. The following constituencies have had multiple opportunity to provide feedback and comment on the proposed changes: chancellors and presidents, athletics directors association, conference commissioners association, faculty athletics representatives, coaches associations and, most importantly, the student athletes. You've already heard from a number of them pledging their support.

Specifically, chancellors and presidents from all 22 conferences were invited to attend a meeting on April 29 to discuss the initiatives. Of those 22 conferences, all of our conferences were represented. Coming out of that meeting, there was broad based support for the proposals. In fact, some chancellors and presidents didn't think that the proposed changes had gone far enough. But all of the presidents and chancellors committed to this multiphased approach. At the Convention, at our meeting of presidents, approximately 70 Division II presidents again discussed and reaffirmed their commitment to this legislation.

This has clearly been a broad based effort on our part to bring this legislation forward. So I would encourage your support of not just this particular proposal, but the complete package. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Robert Hiebert (California Collegiate Athletic Association):** Bob Hiebert, commissioner of the California Collegiate Athletic Association. I'm here today to speak on behalf of our presidents and chancellors group, of the 11 institutions and one provisional member of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

We fully support the academic success of our student athletes, and have that as one of our number one priorities, as does this division. We are fully supportive of the welfare guarding the welfare of our student athletes and enhancing the championship experience of our student athletes, also.

Our presidents, in discussing this on two different occasions at length, are in agreement that we view our conference in a Life in the Balance situation to be very, very acceptable and have our students fully integrated into the academic process and the activity process that they need to do as student athletes in each of our respective institutions.

We're very appreciative of the efforts of the Presidents Council and the Management Council to assist us in steps to help our institutions out during these difficult economic times. However, the CCAA is opposed to these Life in the Balance proposals, each one of them, Proposal Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8, and we base the opposition on the following points.

First of all, the rationale and justification for these four proposals, we feel, has been inconsistent, and the legislation has been rushed through the normal legislation cycle.

I think you may recall in March, the rationale included cost savings and cost reductions. That was not data driven. There was no data produced that or even asked for solicited information, "Would this, in fact, actually save money?" And if that was the case, we still have a big question on why it wasn't applied to all sports in the fall semester.

Late in April, the rationale became academic success. That academic success was supported by data. That data indicated that our athletes, our student athletes, are achieving at higher rates than the general student population. Increases have been made in practically each sport through the course of the year. However, the two sports that remain of concern were men's football and men's basketball. Yet none of the rationale in the proposal at that point had any kind of reduction tied to those two sports.

We move now, then, to a defense of these positions on what's called a Life in the Balance. That's yet to be defined by this association. Our presence and our definition of "Life in the Balance," finds that we are in complete compliance with that, and this legislation is not necessary.

The justification of these proposals has come with limited consultation, in our opinion. That's been widely publicized, and this has been fully vetted, but we feel the majority of this vetting and this consultation has been conducted through NCAA appointed committees, as opposed to typically done by our stakeholders.

I think we've viewed the last few years very positively with this Association. We have watched the definition of this Association be defined through a very careful process. We've watched the strategic-positioning platform be designed through a very careful process. And we've watched the regionalization concept be defined through a very complete process. That process involves stakeholders involved in discussion periods, before policies and proposals were suggested.

We think the stakeholders in this proposal, these four proposals, are the student athletes, the coaches that have to coach these student athletes, are hired to coach these student athletes, and our administrators that are responsible for conducting

these programs and making sure the finances, economic conditions are in their best interests.

In polling our CCAA stakeholders, there is no support for any of these proposals. Additionally, it's been reported by many of our delegates and others, that there has been an unrealistic timeline in these proposals, and undue pressure put on some of these members to come to a decision that supports these proposals.

Secondly, the packaging and the presentation of these proposals has been very disappointing. The CCAA is very disappointed in the manner in which we are asked to vote on this legislation. We've used starting dates and numbers of contests as separate issues. They are related in a sense, but they are truly separate issues.

We're used to having in this division, legislation that is sponsored by the Presidents Council and the Management Council, be fully researched, fully data driven and fully comprehensive on a sport by sport basis, considering both the championship and the nonchampionship segments, before legislation is sponsored. In this case, this is not the case at all.

We also believe the action taken in support of these proposals during the last 10 months is unprecedented. Videos, PSAs, numerous staff travels, publications, outlets supporting the passage of these proposals have really been unprecedented. And we're not sure, if this action continues, that we want to follow this precedent, in terms of supporting proposed legislation, not division changing policies.

Lastly, this legislation, in fact, is permissive. There are four proposals that we are addressing. These four proposals that we are addressing are concerning NCAA rule components that are permissive in nature. Maximum numbers of contests are exactly that. Many of our institutions currently, and in the past, are not even coming close to scheduling those maximum contests. But those that wish to do that, we think have the right to have that continued, and we would appreciate that being allowed to happen.

Permissive numbers of contests and starting dates are permissive legislation. And we encourage institutions to vote on what is best for their student athletes and their programs to achieve their goals.

We are under the impression and still under the I think the ruling, that this division remains a one institution/one vote procedure. And we are hopeful that you will vote to maintain the rules in place until adequate and responsible dialogue has been conducted to determine if change is needed.

I'll take a personal note to explain one concept that has not been discussed in any area yet. I've had the privilege and the responsibility of being a voting delegate for 30 years to this Convention. I've been a coach in this division for 20 years. I've been very proud of this division, and appreciative of the division, in the efforts to be able to allow us to recruit highly successful student athletes.

I think your student athletes will agree, as will many of us, that many of our student athletes that arrive on our campuses, did not start out initially looking at Division II. They were looking at Division I opportunities. After reviewing these Division I opportunities and looking at the coaching staffs, the facilities and the aid offered to them, our full ride in Division II still looks like a full ride in Division I. We just don't have as many of them. And our contests look the same as Division I. We have the same amount, basically, being offered.

If this legislation passes, we're giving many of our Division I recruiters a tool they don't need. But the interesting part of that is, we're giving that in some sports, not all sports. That, to me, is something that this division has not done before. Unfortunately, I think this is really going to have a negative effect ...

**Mr. Jordan:** You have one minute remaining.

**Mr. Hiebert:** I didn't know we had a time limit.

**Mr. Jordan:** There is a 10 minute time limit.

**Mr. Hiebert:** Thank you.

Unfortunately, I believe this will disproportionately affect our high quality programs.

Lastly, on behalf of the CCAA presidents and chancellors, we want to thank the Presidents Council and the Management Council for their efforts in bringing this legislation forward, but we feel it has been rushed and is inconsistent legislation that is not needed.

We suggest that a comprehensive study be conducted on a sport by sport basis to review each sports championship and nonchampionship segment, to determine if change is, in fact, needed. We urge a "no" vote on Proposal Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** The chair would like to remind all delegates who are speaking to confine their remarks to the motion that is on the table only. Thank you.

Microphone No. 2.

**Ernest McNealey (Stillman College):** I'm Ernest McNealey, president of Stillman College, and a member of the Division II Presidents Council. I rise to speak in support and to urge your support of Proposal No. 2010 5.

Over the past year presidents and chancellors have discussed the need to correct season creep that has occurred with the length of the playing season and maximum contests or dates of competition in fall sports. This conversation has not been limited to presidents and chancellors. Discussion has occurred with conference commissioners, athletic directors, student

athletes and coaches association. As such, it has been well vetted.

Proposal No. 2010 5 is a compilation and compromise of the vast opinions and philosophies of each of these groups. As previously noted by my Presidents Council colleague, the proposal will reduce the length of the playing season in all fall sports, except football. It will push back the first contest date by one week in all sports, which, in turn, means that student athletes will report for the preseason practice later in the summer.

Finally, Proposal No. 2010 5 will reduce contests or dates of competition in three sports: field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball.

The Division II philosophy and positioning platform sets forth a goal for all members: to provide student athletes with a path to graduation, while cultivating a variety of skills and knowledge for life ahead. An institution of higher education offers much more to students than academics and intercollegiate athletics. That is why the division's concept of balance is more than establishing boundaries to permit student athletes equal time for academic endeavors and time for perfecting their sport.

This legislative package, which focuses on balance, is not intended to be punitive in nature and should not be seen as taking away from student athletes.

Students, including student athletes, should have an opportunity to achieve personal fulfillment in other activities than intercollegiate athletics, such as music, theater, student government, fraternities and sororities, just to name a few. Proposal No. 2010 5 begins to actually give back to student athletes.

In addition, data has shown that Division II student athletes in some sports spend almost as much time, if not more, on athletics, than their Division I counterparts. This is a concern of presidents and chancellors. However, presidents and chancellors are able to confirm, by the academic success rate, that student athletes are performing well in the classroom. It should be noted that we are proud of the academic success of our students.

Opponents of this legislation will then have argued that changes are based solely on economic issues facing our member institutions, and we should not make changes based on the current economy.

In reality, yes, there is an economic benefit, but the changes are being recommended as part of a broader review of the legislation, to impart benefits to student athletes and academic administrators by streamlining seasons, reducing contests and helping to establish better balance, which is the core of Division II athletics.

We all recognize that one of the supplemental benefits of these changes is the better business practices that will alleviate some of the financial pressures on athletic departments. Not recognizing this benefit, would be hypocritical.

Once again, though, the main reason for the changes set forth in the proposal is to create balance. These minimal changes, while described as drastic by some, will hopefully preserve the opportunity for a rich athletics experience for all our student athletes for years to come.

For this reason, and the ones stated previously, I hope that you will join me in supporting and voting "yes" for Proposal No. 5.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Thomas Haas (Grand Valley State University):** My name is Tom Haas, president, Grand Valley State University, member of GLIAC. I am in strong support of this proposal and those in this package.

I go back and I think through my time as a student athlete, playing basketball and baseball, and then as a coach, coaching baseball, women's basketball, as head coach of women's softball, and I look at those opportunities that focus in on student success and those experiences, and now as president of Grand Valley State University, still focusing in on student success. As a member of Division II, I think it is student success that drives us as a division, and that division of balance, balance in all of our activities on our campus that support student success.

I believe that supporting Proposal No. 5 and those in this package is a statement of what we are as a division. I do believe that this action really is, at its core, an issue of integrity for Division II.

I'm reminded of a wise coach that I had. He told me one time, he said, "Tom, character is really exposed on the field of play." I think this is our field of play, and our character will be exposed with the right decision. And the right decision is to support this package.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Earl Edwards (University of California, San Diego):** Earl Edwards, director of athletics, the University of California, San Diego. On behalf of the student athletes of the CCAA, I am here to represent their unanimous opposition to the Life in the Balance package.

They are not opposed to the concept of Life in the Balance. What they are opposed to is the elimination of contests as the primary focus, versus other alternative activities, such as offseason practices and contests and other athletic related activities.

We urge you to defeat these proposals, and let's continue to explore other options for achieving Life in the Balance.

On a personal note, in terms of being the athletics director at UC San Diego, I know that many of our students are very involved with other activities on campus, besides athletics. I would suspect that many of our athletes are the same throughout

the country, in terms of being involved in other activities on campus.

Having said that, I would like us to take that into consideration, that our athletes are doing a lot of things across the board already, at a very high level, that's not related to athletics. So if that's one of the primary focuses.

I would challenge us to do a survey on the regular, general student population and see how many of those students are involved in campus activities, versus our student athletes. So if that's one of the primary focuses, I think we should look at that, as well, as we move forward. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Jaime Lundgren (University of Nebraska at Kearney):** Good morning. My name is Jamie Lundgren, senior woman administrator at the University of Nebraska at Kearney, a former Division II student athlete and a former National SAAC member.

I would like to take this time to urge you to oppose Proposal No. 2010 5 for one major reason, being that our student athletes are recruited to come to our institutions to compete, such as a member of a marching band is recruited to come to an institution to be a part of the band. They understand the demands that are placed on them.

I also understand that we would like our student athletes to be well-rounded. However, I feel our student athletes are already more well-rounded than the normal student on campus.

Therefore, I believe we have approached the Life in the Balance incorrectly and should not be taking away their opportunity to compete. Therefore, once again, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 2010 5. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**David Rankin (Southern Arkansas University):** I'm David Rankin, president, Southern Arkansas University, Gulf South Conference, and I serve on the Presidents Council.

I strongly support Proposal No. 2010 5. I think that we're doing two things here when we do this. Really, I believe we're helping the student athlete because I think season creep is a reality. I think it's very difficult for an individual institution, or even a conference, to deal with this particular issue. That's why I believe it is an NCAA level issue. I think it's important for this body to take a stand on this.

Secondly, the presidents and chancellors that are here have to go back to our campuses, and we have to speak to our faculties and our staffs about trying to be more efficient, to try and make our resources move a little further. I think the NCAA has a responsibility here, too. I believe that this recommendation, in fact, this package, takes a giant step in that particular direction. Not harming, but helping student competitiveness and the quality of their life, helping universities, and helping the presidents, athletics directors, coaches, and others deal with the issues and the pressures that we are facing here every day.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have stated this for 12 months. We have had 12 NCAA committees give us input. I believe that is an adequate time to make an informed decision on this particular proposal. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Suzanne Sanregret (Michigan Technological University):** Good morning. Suzanne Sanregret, athletics director, Michigan Tech University, member of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and member of the Division II Management Council.

On behalf of the Management Council, I urge you to support Proposal No. 2010 5. This Life in the Balance proposal has many elements and amends the playing and practice season for fall sports. Specifically, Proposal No. 2010 5 reduces the length of the season and reduces contests or dates of competition in specific sports.

It should be noted that each component of the proposal builds on a previous component. For example, once it was determined that the first contest should be moved to one week later and the championship dates in cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball should be maintained, the maximum number of contests or dates of competition needed to be adjusted to account for the shortened season. Fitting the same number of contests or dates of competition into a shorter season was not an option.

It is important to note that the game reductions in Proposal No. 2010 5 were not arbitrarily selected. Data was used from the Championship Score Reporting System to determine how many contests were completed each week during the championship segment over a three year period. The reduction in contests and dates of competition were based on the length of the championship season being reduced by one week, and the average number of contests completed in a week for each sport.

Although Proposal No. 2010 5 may seem dramatic to some delegates, it is a small step that is necessary to help athletics departments in a time of uncertainty. Let's join together and make the right choice for Division II. As such, I strongly urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 3.

**Tom Shirley (Philadelphia University):** Tom Shirley, director of athletics, Philadelphia University. I would like to ask that we call the question.

**Mr. Jordan:** Let me just see. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? If there isn't, then there's no need to move the question. We will move to the vote.

It is now time to decide Proposal No. 5 as amended, or as originally submitted, by a roll call vote. Please use your voting unit to cast your vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no," or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

There are five seconds remaining to cast your vote.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 5 as amended is adopted.

Proposal No. 6 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010.

Microphone No. 1.

**Ms. Pitts:** I'm Beverly Pitts from the University of Indianapolis and member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2010 6.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved, and it has been seconded.

Microphone No. 1.

**Ms. Pitts:** This is the second proposal in the Life in the Balance package, which is designed to align the playing and practice season regulations with the division's strategic-positioning platform.

The proposal reduces the number of contests in baseball by six contests, from 56 to 50. In addition, this proposal will eliminate the tournament-dates exception in softball and reduce the dates of competition in golf from 24 to 21.

These changes will decrease the number of days that student athletes are away from campus. Furthermore, student athletes will miss fewer classes and have additional time to devote for their studies.

In each of these areas, the intention is not to take punitive action or reduce the competitive opportunities for our student athletes. Rather, the intention is to promote the opportunities for our student athletes to engage in campus activities and spend time in their academic endeavors without having to balance such a heavy competition load.

We are continuously impressed by the academic success of our student athletes and their desire to graduate as well rounded individuals, ready to be active members of society, and we want to continue to encourage that balance.

For these reasons, I urge you to join me and my fellow Presidents Council colleagues in supporting this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Stephen Green (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association):** Good morning. My name is Stephen Green from the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, and I'm a member of the National Student Athletes Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 6 for the following reasons:

This proposal reduces the number of contests in baseball from 56 to 50, eliminates the tournament exception in softball, and reduces the dates of competition in golf from 24 to 21. These reductions will have a significant impact on student athlete well-being and will provide balance for student athletes.

As student athletes, we want to compete. However, the amount of time spent on athletics by baseball, softball and golf student athletes during championship segment creates a difficult balance between academics and athletics. Student athletes are missing many classes and are struggling to find time to study and keep up with the demands of athletics and academics.

This proposal supports the continued success of student athletes in the classroom, while offering us the opportunity to compete at a high level.

We strive to be the best in all of our endeavors and believe this proposal will assist with both academic and athletic excellence. We encourage you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 5.

**Darrell Axtell (St. Martin's University):** Darrell Axtell, St. Martin's University, member of the FARA Legislative Review Committee. I stand in support of Proposal No. 2010 6.

FARA recognizes the positive impact of this proposal on academic integrity and believes the proposed reduction in the number of contests and dates of competition will reduce missed class time, to the benefit of our student athletes. FARA supports this proposal as part of the Life in the Balance. Please join FARA in support of Proposal No. 2010 6.

**Mr. Jordan:** Anyone else wish to speak to Proposal No. 6? If not, it is now time to decide Proposal No. 6.

Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," the number 2 to vote "no," or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 6 is adopted.

Proposal No. 7 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010. However, contracts signed before August 6, 2009, for contests or dates of competition occurring between December 20, 2010, and December 26, 2010, may be honored.

There is also an amendment to amendment, Proposal No. 7 1, sponsored by the Great Northwest Athletic Conference, that

will be considered by roll call vote. Please refer back to Page No. 24 in the Official Notice for Proposal No. 7 1, which states that it is permissible for an institution to travel on December 20, after an away from home competition that occurs on December 19, provided that it is the earliest practical opportunity to return to campus.

Also please note in your green procedural issues document, the interpretation and modification of wording adopted by the Management Council related to Proposal No. 7.

Microphone No. 5.

**Cheryl Norton (Southern Connecticut State University):** Cheryl Norton, president of Southern Connecticut State University, chair of the Presidents Council of the Northeast 10, and member of the Presidents Council Division II.

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2010 7.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 5.

**Ms. Norton:** This is the third proposal in the Presidents Council package designed to align the playing and practice seasons with the division's strategic-positioning platform. Proposal No. 2010 7 establishes a so called dead period from December 20 through December 26 in the sports of basketball, swimming and diving, indoor track and field, and wrestling.

During this dead period, or winter break, student athletes would not be allowed to participate in practice, competition or other countable athletically related activities. During this seven day winter break, it would also be impermissible for an institution's team to travel to or from away from home contests.

In addition to the winter break for the four Division II championship winter sports, the proposal also establishes a winter break for all sports during the same dates. During this time, it would not be permissible for a student athlete in any sport to participate in voluntary activities on campus, unless the campus facility is open to the general student body.

This proposal addresses many of the concerns that presidents and chancellors have continually voiced regarding how athletic time commitments are increasingly eroding time for student athletes to be students, and compromising the work/life balance of the institutional administrators.

By establishing the same seven days for all student athletes and coaches in Division II, both groups will be able to enjoy the winter break and focus on other areas of their lives, without worrying about competitive commitments.

In addition, athletic administrators, athletic trainers and sports information officers will be able to have a legitimate seven day period when all winter sports are not practicing or competing, and all other sports have limitations on voluntary activities.

It's also important to note that because all institutions will have the same seven day winter break, it will reduce the potential for scheduling conflicts.

Other options considered by the Presidents Council for the winter break would have allowed each sport or team to pick a seven day period for its winter break during a larger window in December. This concept, which may appear more flexible, however, does not provide work/life balance for our athletic department staff members, since they would need to be available to monitor each team's activities. In addition, this option would create the opportunity for potential scheduling conflicts for the winter sports.

Let me reiterate. This legislative package is about balance, not just for our student athletes, but our athletic department staffs, as well. With the establishment of a seven day winter break, Proposal No. 2010 7 will hopefully begin to create a better sense of balance for our winter sport student athletes, their coaches and other athletic department staff members.

For these reasons, I urge you to join me and my fellow Presidents Council colleagues in support of this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 5.

**Dede Allen (University of Alaska Anchorage):** Good morning. Dede Allen, associate director of athletics at the University of Alaska Anchorage. On behalf of the Great Northwest Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 2010 7 1.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there a second? It's been seconded.

Microphone No. 5.

**Ms. Allen:** Thank you, Chairman Jordan.

I'd ask the membership to consider adoption of the amendment. In the event that Proposal No. 2010 7 is adopted, then this amendment is critical for the institutions located in remote areas, or with many opponents not in close proximity to one another.

This amendment gives more flexibility to geographically remote member institutions to use the root proposal as intended. Without this amendment, members like the University of Alaska Anchorage, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Northwest Nazarene University and Montana State Billings, to name a few, will be put at a disadvantage of traveling great distances to our nearest opponent.

A team playing a contest on the 19th, in many cases, cannot begin travel by 11:59 p.m. Members in remote areas would not receive a competitive advantage if this amendment passes. Because many of them only have air travel as a means of transportation to contests, they are at the mercy of the size of the airport, the number of airlines servicing that airport, and

flight schedules.

Scheduling opponents in remote locations is almost always a challenge, and the economy has not helped that situation. Without this amendment, scheduling other in region games will become very problematic for some of us, making it harder for us to qualify for postseason play. This would be an inadvertent competitive advantage for those institutions residing in metropolitan areas, or participating in conferences with smaller geographic boundaries. This certainly will have a negative impact on the student athlete experience.

Playing earlier in the day, or another date, impacts a member's ability to create their version of Division II image and a positive game environment.

Coaches and administrators are the only constituency that can or should make decisions regarding contest dates and times, to attract fans, and to effectively market their programs.

It's been said, "Just play your closest opponent during this time." Well, where I'm from, the closest opponent is 350 miles away on a two lane highway that is frost heaved during the winter months. It's not necessarily an option for us.

In addition to those types of issues, there are mountain roads and passes in the west region, where night and winter travel is inadvisable.

Why create legislation that will automatically result in the generation of waiver requests. This piece of legislation creates a situation which will require legislative relief waivers, which is a time consuming process, with a staff that is already overburdened with EADA, ATS, certifications, midyear certifications, rules education and all other day to day tasks that we perform to the best of our ability.

Again, I ask for your support of Proposal No. 2010 7 1.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 5.

**Erin O'Connell (Seattle Pacific University):** My name is Erin O'Connell. I'm the director of athletics at Seattle Pacific University and the chair of the Great Northwest Athletic Conference Management Council. I speak in support of 2010 7 1.

Student athletes, coaches and athletics staff members should be allowed to spend the holiday season with their families. Coaches know when rest for the body and soul is necessary. We support a seven day dead period in the sport of basketball. However, the decision to mandate that all travel must commence by 11:59 p.m. on December 19 is a challenge for particular institutions.

"Geographically unique" also means geographically challenged. Institutions in Hawaii, Alaska, Montana, Idaho, New Mexico, Colorado and Texas, and their fellow conference or region members, likely cannot commence air travel to return to campus by the 11:59 p.m. curfew after a December 19 competition. Airports in particular locales are not close to campus, and flights are not available on demand for a restrictive timetable.

A travel time allowance to return to campus at the first available and safe opportunity will be a fair addition to Bylaw 2010 7. Otherwise, institutions residing in the aforementioned states find themselves at a competitive disadvantage in two respects: They cannot play away on December 19 because they can't physically begin a return to their campus prior to 11:59 p.m.; and they will not be able to book a home competition on December 19 because the opposing team would not be able to begin their return travel prior to 11:59 p.m., as well.

Please consider this amendment to the amendment in the positive spirit in which it was designed, to allow opportunity for all student athletes to compete on December 19 if such a contest is scheduled.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Higgins:** Thank you, Dr. Jordan. Kelly Higgins, athletics director, Fort Lewis College. I commend Dede and the Great Northwest Conference for moving this amendment.

It actually is a great assist to schools such as Fort Lewis College, which has to pass over two or three mountain passes on almost every single winter event. When you go home, or try to get home, from Gunnison, Colorado, to Durango, and it has snowed 8 inches on Red Mountain Pass, you can't go. You have to stay. It is dangerous to do anything else.

This is very good legislation. I think it must pass; otherwise we're putting people in jeopardy and giving back that competitive advantage we try so hard to stay away from.

So, please, I urge you to pass this amendment for the benefit of the student athlete who travels.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Bob Hogue (Pacific West Conference):** Hello, everyone. Bob Hogue, Pac West commissioner.

Have you ever been to Silver City, New Mexico? Have you ever been to St. George, Utah? Have you ever been to Arcadia, California? Have you ever been to Fairbanks, Alaska? Have you ever been to Hilo, Hawaii? Have you ever tried to get out of those places, and then go east?

The Pac West believes in Life in the Balance. Balance, however, is not accorded with regional distance and time zones. They say, "You can't get there from here." Well, from these places, you can get there, but it takes you until the next day.

Please support this amendment. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Jordan:** Any other delegate wish to speak to Proposal No. 7 1? If not, we will conduct a roll call vote on the amendment

to amendment, Proposal No. 7 1, using your voting units.

It is now time to decide Proposal No. 7 1. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 7 1 is adopted.

Microphone No. 4.

**Mickey Burnim (Bowie State University):** Good morning. I'm Mickey Burnim, president of Bowie State University, a proud member of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, and I'm a member of the Presidents Council.

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 2010 7. The seven day winter break created by this proposal is not intended to take away opportunities for student athletes. Rather, it's intended to give back in the form of student athlete well-being, work/life balance, and more time to devote to social and educational experience.

Not only will this winter break allow student athletes to travel home during the winter break, but it will provide them with additional time to devote to family, friends and work prior to resuming their academic and athletic endeavors in the new year.

On the other hand, coaches, facilities managers, athletic trainers and other institutional athletics personnel will not be required to stay on campus to attend to the management of student athletes and facilities during these seven days of the winter break, which would contribute significantly toward helping them achieve a better work/life balance.

Given that many institutions are closed during the last portions of this winter break, it makes sense to allow student athletes and administrators to devote this time for their personal endeavors, rather than athletic commitments.

Finally, data has shown that institutions have not traditionally played a significant number of contests during this seven day period, which reinforces the statement that this proposal will not take away opportunities for student athletes.

For this reason and those previously mentioned, I urge you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Michael Lane (Emporia State University):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Michael Lane, president, Emporia State, proud member of the Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association.

I concur with everything my distinguished colleague from Bowie State just said. Yet I rise in opposition to this item, based on one and only one fact.

I concur wholeheartedly with the Presidents Council and the legislative group that we need that seven day break. I do not, however, think that specifying the dates is in the best interests of this organization.

I believe that we should come back next year with a proposal that specifies that conferences the 24 conferences are fully capable of coming up with seven days, to include, for example, December 24, 25 and 26 if we consider those important dates, as part of that 10 days. But taking the 20th out, this very year, would have taken a weekend day out, which would potentially add a weekday contest for our basketball programs.

So I rise in opposition, only based on the dates, and request that we defeat this proposal and come back next year with a seven day moratorium, which would be determined by each of the conferences. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Frank Webbe (Florida Institute of Technology):** I'm Frank Webbe, faculty athletics representative from Florida Institute of Technology and a member of the FARA Executive Committee. On behalf of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I stand in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 7.

Although FARA strongly supports the concept of a seven-consecutive-day winter break, the Division II faculty athletics representatives oppose this proposal due to the inflexibility of the designated seven day period.

As FARs, we recognize that university calendars, final exam schedules and institutional and conference policies regarding practice and the competition during the final exam period are not all the same. And this proposal places a one size fits all constraint on the membership.

The fact that it took two or more pages in the green handout, both for amendment, as well as modification of wording, suggests that it might be wise to go back and revisit the entire wording and concept of this particular proposal.

Please join FARA in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 7.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Brittanie Roldan (Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association):** Good morning. My name is Brittanie Roldan, from the Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association. I'm a member of the National Student Athlete Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 7 for the following reasons:

This proposal promotes the student athlete Life in the Balance by providing a break from December 20 through 26. All teams, coaches and student athletes in the sports of basketball, swimming and diving, indoor track and field, and wrestling,

will be required to abstain from all countable athletically related activities, including practice and competition. These teams would also not be allowed to travel during the seven day period.

In addition, this proposal would establish a winter break for all sports during the same period. This would ensure that every student athlete gets the holiday season to take a break from voluntary athletically related activities on the institution's campus. However, student athletes would be allowed to use an institution's facilities during this time period, only if it was open and available to the general student body.

We, as student athletes, along with our coaches and staff, dedicate an abundance of our time and energy to our respective athletic programs. To be given the opportunity to have a week with our families, away from athletic activity and free from the worry that other teams could be potentially gaining an advantage, will not only create an even playing field for all, but will truly contribute to moving forward with the Life in the Balance initiative. We encourage you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Hiebert:** Bob Hiebert, commissioner of the California Collegiate Athletic Association. On behalf of our CCAA presidents and chancellors group, Executive Council and the SAAC, we oppose this proposal.

Vacation periods are presently handled best, we feel, for our student athletes and staff, in relation to the appropriate academic calendars, the vacation periods and the facility availabilities that are mandated by each of our individual institutions. We think this legislation is insensitive to the differences that exist in all of our Division II institutions.

The action also may be precedent setting in the fact that we're going against some of the cultures of our sports, these winter sports, without really any substantive data being generated.

We think this is a good idea in concept. And I think we're all dealing with this on each of our campuses appropriately. The well-being of our student athletes during this vacation period is of high priority.

The Commissioners Association, on two different occasions, has offered flexible proposals for implementation, and both have been rejected for reasons unknown.

We like the concept of having some time off, but the mandated period is very difficult to administer fairly across the board. As we were looking through scenarios on this, this may be a little tongue in cheek, but I think it's something you may want to consider. If this proposal passes as written, we're going to take our mandated furlough breaks from the 20th to the 26th, we're going to return back to our campuses on the 27th to greet our student athletes in basketball, wrestling, swimming, indoor track. Already on our campus may be other coaching staffs, allowed by an interp to offer fundraising camps. If we have any student athlete concerns, we're not going to be able to contact the national office because they are still on vacation until January 2 and January 3.

So if we could get the NCAA Division II staff to take the same vacation we are, the 20th to 26th, return to a closed NCAA office, like many are going to return to closed campuses during that same period, we might be able to help each other's needs out.

We think this legislation is fraught with more complications from a compliance standpoint, than it has advantages. We urge your defeat of this. Bring us back with legislation, better, to be adopted next year.

**Mr. Jordan:** The chair would ask that commenters confine their remarks to the motion and not direct them towards individuals.

Microphone No. 5.

**Lloyd Raymond (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference):** Butch Raymond, commissioner of the Northern Sun, and vice chairman of the Management Council.

On behalf of the Management Council, I encourage you to support Proposal No. 2010 7. By adopting this proposal, you will support the efforts of the Presidents Council toward achieving a balance between academics and athletics for Division II student athletes and athletics administrators.

This is a unique opportunity for presidents, faculty, student athletes and administrators across the division to make a statement about the importance of the balance component of the strategic-positioning platform. To reinforce that, the emphasis in the student athlete experience is not only athletics competition, but also academic achievement and development of positive societal attitudes. Additionally, this winter break might actually help retain coaches and other athletics personnel, from a work/life perspective.

This proposal will reduce the winter sports championships segment by one week. But most importantly, it would allow student athletes and athletics administrators a life, to be able to take time off without worrying about athletics commitments.

For these reasons and those previously stated, I urge you to vote in support of this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there anyone else wishing to speak to Proposal No. 7?

Microphone No. 4.

**Clint Bryant (Augusta State University):** I'm Clint Bryant, director of athletics for Augusta State University.

I appreciate the efforts of the Presidents Council and Management Council in their concept of the dead period. I think it's a very worthy cause. What concerns me is those institutions that have exams leading up to this period of time will put their

student athletes in a more difficult situation because coaches are not going to go two weeks without practicing. It's going to put added pressure on our student athletes of practicing during exam periods. And I think that's against the grain of what we're trying to do here. If at any time they should not be practicing or participating, it's that time during the exam periods.

I would like to see a three day moratorium, if you will, or dead period, before final exams even begin. That, to me, makes sense.

At Augusta State University we feel very strongly in institutional control. Dr. William A. Bloodworth, our president, will ensure that we are doing the right thing about practice and playing during this period of time.

Now, to the argument that our faculty, our staff members will have to work during this period, well, last time I checked, they are mandated to work, anyway, up to the 21st, 22nd or 23rd of December, before their vacation starts, anyway. So we're going to be there doing our jobs.

I think that although this is conceptually good legislation, to be quite candid, I don't need this Association telling me what particular days that we need to take. Let we, as institutions, have autonomy to decide. If there's a dead period of seven days, let us decide that.

Now, Life in the Balance, if there's an opportunity for student athletes to participate in a contest on the 26th or 27th of December, and that's a good thing to do, I think it's a positive experience for our student athletes and their programs.

So I stand in opposition of this proposal and would hope that the Presidents Council and the Management Council would come back with a better alternative. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Higgins (Fort Lewis College):** Kelly Higgins, athletics director, Fort Lewis College. Clint said it better than I could possibly say. I stand down.

I urge you to defeat this.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Frances Nee (Indiana University of Pennsylvania):** Frances Nee, associate athletic director, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, member of the Management Council.

The governance structure discussed the possibility of permitting institutions and/or coaches in each sport at an institution, to choose a seven-consecutive-calendar-day period within a particular window of time to establish a winter break. While many individuals may think this approach is more flexible, it actually has a negative impact on the work/life balance of athletic administrators because they will always have to be available during the winter break. This is contrary to the intent of the proposed legislation.

Another concern that was raised about this approach was that institutions across the country and within a conference would potentially have a different seven day winter break. Conference members and any region opponents would likely have a difficult time scheduling games during December.

Please remember that the coaches who are members of the National Association of Basketball Coaches initiate discussion on a consistent seven day break in December. The basketball coaches who attended the national convention in Detroit in April 2009 agreed that this is a good approach to align the playing and practice season with the division strategic plan and provide better work/life balance.

This position was reinforced via memorandum in June 2009, which specified that the National Association of Basketball Coaches, Division II conference, unanimously supported a dead week at the end of the fall semester, in which no games or practice would be permissible.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 2010 7. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference):** Thank you. Nate Salant, commissioner of the Gulf South Conference. I have a question.

Would a student athlete working at a basketball camp during those dead period days, a student athlete who cannot go home because either he or she cannot afford to fly back to his or her country, or has no place to go, or just an opportunity to work at camp that would be beneficial in the community, would this preclude that student athlete from working at that institutional camp?

**Mr. Jordan:** We have a consultation going on. We'll get a response.

**Stephanie Smith (NCAA staff):** Stephanie Smith, academic and membership affairs.

Nate, the student athlete would be permitted to work that camp, provided that the legislation in Bylaw 13 for camps and clinics has been satisfied. That is a question and answer that is included in the question-and-answer document that was posted January 6.

**Mr. Salant:** This is something that is very important. I wanted to make sure that that was clarified publicly, rather than just in a Q and A because for many institutions, that does matter. We have certainly several in the Gulf South Conference that do conduct those kinds of camps. And since that would not be precluded, I wanted to make sure that we had an official inter-

pretation, publicly stated. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Edward Matejkovic (West Chester University of Pennsylvania):** Ed Matejkovic, athletics director of West Chester University of Pennsylvania. Point of clarification.

There are five of us in the country who sponsor gymnastics. I would assume I think I asked this question before. I would assume that gymnastics would be covered by this legislation if it did pass.

**Ms. Smith:** Stephanie Smith, academic and membership affairs.

Gymnastics would not be covered under this legislation for the competition and practice opportunities. That's because of the fact that they are a national collegiate championship, and that prohibition applies to Division II championship sports.

That being said, the prohibition on voluntary activities would apply to those student athletes.

**Mr. Matejkovic:** Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Any further discussion on Proposal No. 7? If not, it is now time to decide Proposal No. 7 by roll call vote.

Please use your voting unit to cast your vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 7 is adopted as amended.

Proposal No. 8 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010.

Microphone No. 3.

**Philip Gerbino (University of the Sciences in Philadelphia):** On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2010 8.

**Mr. Jordan:** Proposal No. 8 has been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 3.

**Mr. Gerbino:** I'm Phil Gerbino, president of the University of Sciences in Philadelphia, member of the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference and member of the Presidents Council.

This is the fourth proposal in the Presidents Council package designed to align the playing and practice season regulations with the division's strategic-positioning platform.

Under current legislation, the maximum permissible number of contest in men's and women's basketball is 27. This proposal reduces that number by one.

Recent data from a longitudinal study of time demands supports the notion that many NCAA student athletes are spending more time on the court than in the classroom. Data has indicated that Division II students in some sports are devoting almost as much time, if not more, to athletics, as their Division I counterparts.

If adopted, this proposal would likely result in less missed class time, missed study time and time away from the campus for basketball student athletes, which should contribute to improved academic performance overall.

While the proposal would only reduce the maximum number of contests in basketball by one, it will certainly bring this sport closer, a little closer, to the balance so integral to the division.

For these reasons and for the well-being of our Division I basketball student athletes, I urge that you vote in support of Proposal No. 2010 8.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Brenda Cates (Mount Olive College):** Brenda Cates, faculty athletics representative, Mount Olive College, and FARA Division II vice president. On behalf of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I stand in support of Proposal No. 2010 8.

FARA supports this proposal due to its potential to positively impact student athlete well-being. At the Division II general business session yesterday, we heard retired Brigadier General Sheila Baxter speak of her student athlete experience, an experience highlighted by a 17 game basketball season.

Proposal No. 2010 8, which reduces the maximum number of basketball contests from 27 to 26, is likely to benefit student athletes by reducing missed class time, missed study time and time away from campus, thereby contributing to a more balanced academic athletic and extracurricular experience for our student athletes.

I encourage you to join FARA in supporting Proposal No. 2010 8.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Rocky Horn (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference):** Good morning. My name is Rocky Horn from the Northern Sun Intercollegiate. I am a member of the National Student Athlete Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 8 for the following reasons:

This proposal reduces the number of contests in basketball from 27 to 26. We support the goal of Division II presidents to create a Life in the Balance for all student athletes and believe the reduction of one contest will assist basketball student

athletes and is an appropriate reduction for this sport.

This reduction will allow for less missed class time, additional time on campus to participate in academic and campus activities, and more study time for basketball student athletes.

Due to the mandatory winter break, the basketball season will be reduced by one week. Therefore, it is critical to reduce the number of games so that basketball student athletes are not required to compete in the same number of games during a shortened time period.

We encourage you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there anyone else wishing to speak to Proposal No. 8?

Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Higgins:** Yes, it's me again. Kelly Higgins, athletics director for Fort Lewis College.

At the risk of being run over by the Silverton train in Durango here, I wish to make two very brief comments.

From what I was told yesterday in our conference meetings, during the 20th to the 26th there were 11 basketball games in all of Division II last year. I believe if I'm incorrect, someone can tell me, but that's what I was told by a Management Council member. It would seem to me that 11 basketball games, amongst almost 300 members with basketball, is not a tremendous amount of impact.

No. 2, I don't think that there's several, or many, sports that actually are out of balance, when it compares to the amount of time spent on academics versus athletics, compared to members of Division I. I believe women's swimming was the only one that actually had slightly more time spent than Division I.

Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Mr. Salant:** Nate Salant, commissioner of the Gulf South Conference. I'd ask that some consideration, some thought, be given to a couple of issues.

I'm concerned because I keep hearing, and I'm having trouble understanding, how, for example, playing one less basketball game will enable our basketball players to participate in so many more extracurricular activities, when, in fact, they will be in the gym practicing their normal 20 hours, and whatever else might be going on.

Most of the extracurricular activities, from what our faculty are telling me and other people are telling me, are not single event, one time, "Instead of going to a basketball game, I'm going to be in a theatrical production," or any other kind of thing. So I'm just looking to try to balance this myself.

The second thing is I'm worried about regionalization, quite honestly. Taking away a basketball game, from what I'm hearing in this room from people who are talking about this, the game that will be lost is not going to be a home game against a non Division II opponent that you know you are going to beat. It is probably going to be an in region, nonconference game. In some regions where that is already a tough thing, the loss of the game hurts.

So I am in support of the whole Life in the Balance proposal, but there are some little things in there that I'm getting a lot of push back on, and I'm asking for responses or explanations. I, again, emphasize I support this, but I think these are a couple of issues that should get some airing. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Grunenwald:** Joseph Grunenwald, president, Clarion University, Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference, member of the Presidents Council.

As we review the playing and practice seasons legislation, one of the goals is to ensure that the division's behaviors, in and out of athletics competition, match the attributes identified in the platform that we propose. If this proposal is adopted, Division II student athletes will be able to participate each academic year in 26 basketball contests.

This still requires student athletes to devote a significant amount of time. However, it takes a positive step, albeit a small one, toward the balance that we continue to strive for.

This proposal starts to address many of the concerns expressed by Division II presidents and chancellors, to the effect that the balance aspect of the strategic-positioning platform has become skewed by the ever growing time commitments that comprise class work and a playing schedule that, over the years, has become more populated with exempted contests, regular season games and postseason tournaments.

For these reasons and those previously mentioned, I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to Proposal No. 8? If not, it is now time to decide Proposal No. 8.

Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no," the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 8 is adopted.

Proposal No. 9 deals with the area of personnel and is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010.

Microphone No. 1.

**Richard Cole (Dowling College):** Good morning. My name is Rick Cole. I'm the director of athletics at Dowling College, and a member of the East Coast Conference and the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 2010 9.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 1.

**Mr. Cole:** Thank you.

A survey of the NCAA death claim since 1992 reports that 60 percent of all nonvehicle related deaths have been due to heart related conditions, and 83 percent of all deaths occurred during practice or conditioning.

This proposal would help address these grim statistics and would ultimately strengthen the Division II philosophy, specifically as it relates to the student athletes' safety and well-being.

The safety and well-being of student athletes is of the utmost concern. This proposal helps to strengthen these areas by requiring head coaches and all other coaches who are full time employees at an institution to maintain current certification in first aid, CPR and AED use.

It is important to note that this proposal does not require certified individuals to be present during athletically related activity, nor does it specify the certifying organizations. Further, this proposal does not require institutions to purchase an AED, just that the head coaches and all other coaches who are full time employees at the institution be certified in AED use.

Lastly, it is estimated that the financial impact of this legislation will be minimal. To help defray the impact on the institutions' budgets, Division II conference grant and initiative funding may be used to assist in the payment of the necessary certification courses and may be used to purchase an AED if an institution so desires.

Based on these reasons, I urge you to vote in support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Scott Unruh (University of Nebraska at Kearney):** Scott Unruh, faculty representative, University of Nebraska at Kearney.

I would offer a number of things to consider here. I think we're all, first and foremost, interested in the safety and well-being of the student athletes, but there are some things that I think should be recognized as we look at this.

First, I would point to the Sports Medicine Handbook, the NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook, as some reference. I'll quote some sections from that.

"Each scheduled practice or contest of an institution sponsored intercollegiate athletics event, and all out of season practices and skills sessions, should include an emergency action plan. Like student athlete well-being in general, a plan is a shared responsibility of the athletics department; administrators, coaches and medical personnel should play a role in the establishment of that plan."

It goes on to say that as part of that plan, that there should be the presence of a person qualified and delegated to render emergency care to a stricken participant; that there should be planned access to early defibrillation; that all necessary emergency equipment should be at the site or quickly accessible; that certification in cardiopulmonary resuscitation, first aid and prevention of disease transmission, as outlined by OSHA guidelines, should be required for all athletics personnel associated with practices, competitions, skill instruction and strength conditioning, and that new staff engaged in these activities should comply with those rules within a six month period.

The legislation proposal did go on, as was mentioned a second ago, that the difference with this proposal in the past, is that this proposal differs slightly from the provision that it does not require the certified individual to be present during athletically related activities, nor does it specify their certifying organization.

The question-and-answer document that was sent out does provide some interesting points, and it also references that NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook, as part of this.

Some questions, though, do arise. I think that there's points just to put out here for thinking.

The Sports Medicine Handbook provides standard of care. From a liability standpoint, standard of care is established. So that provides a question, "Does this actually need to be a legislative matter?"

If you are acting in compliance with the Sports Medicine Handbook, you are already working toward that end. And furthermore, you're dealing with the issue of standard of care, which is established in this case.

It does not provide, this legislation, for supervising and taking care of things in the out of season activities that go on. And there are two direct conflicts that exist with this proposal. That, in fact, the certified person doesn't have to be present. It really does not make sense to say that everybody, or certain people, have to be certified, but that they don't have to be present to provide that care.

And moreover, it does not require that you even have AEDs in place. You should have them, and the Sports Medicine Handbook goes on to say that. But it does not provide for that by saying that you're required to do that.

So just some points of thought as we go forward. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Stevi Wheeler (Peach Belt Conference):** Good morning. My name is Stevi Wheeler from the Peach Belt Conference, and I'm a member of the National Student Athlete Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 9 for the following reasons:

This proposal supports the safety of student athletes and athletic staff members by requiring all head coaches and all other coaches who are employed full time by the institution to be certified in first aid, CPR and the use of the AED.

Often, the only personnel attending practice, skill instruction or conditioning activities are the coaching staff members. A large number of institutions do not have enough certified athletic trainers to attend all events. Training additional personnel would, without a doubt, encourage the safety and well-being of student athletes.

For many health issues, it is important that treatment is received in a timely manner. Training additional personnel may reduce the time it takes for an individual to receive assistance and could save a life.

We believe first aid, CPR and AED training is a worthy investment in the health and safety of all student athletes. We encourage you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to Proposal No. 9?

It is now time for our paddle vote on Proposal No. 9. All in favor, please raise your paddles; all opposed, please raise your paddles; abstentions, please raise your paddles.

Proposal No. 9 is adopted.

Proposal No. 10 deals with the area of recruiting and is a roll call vote with an immediate effective date. Therefore, there will be two votes on this proposal.

The immediate effective date will be considered first by a paddle vote. It needs two thirds approval to pass. After the effective-date vote, we will then have the discussion on the proposal, followed by a roll call vote on the merits of Proposal No. 10.

This is also a membership sponsored proposal, sponsored by the Lone Star Conference, the Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and the South Atlantic Conference.

Microphone No. 3.

**Patrick Britz (South Atlantic Conference):** Good morning, Mr. Chair. I'm Patrick Britz, commissioner of the South Atlantic Conference. On behalf of the members of the Lone Star Conference, the Mid American Intercollegiate Athletics Association and the South Atlantic Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 10.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 3.

**Mr. Britz:** Would you like me to go ahead and try to get the immediate effective date approved now, or just the merits of the proposal?

**Mr. Jordan:** Yes, to the effective date.

**Mr. Britz:** There's really no reason to pontificate on that. We'll just put forward the immediate effective date of the proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been seconded. Any further discussion?

It is now time for our paddle vote on Proposal No. 10's immediate effective date. All those in favor, please raise your paddles; all those opposed, please raise your paddles; abstentions, please raise your paddles.

The immediate effective date is adopted.

Microphone No. 3.

**Mr. Britz:** Mr. Chair, currently an institution is required to provide a prospective student athlete written notice of the limit of five official visits prior to the individual taking an official visit to that particular campus.

In this day and age, when failure to have proper administrative oversight in certain areas has landed several institutions on probation and/or required them to suffer harsh penalties, the sponsors of this proposal feel the resources, such as time, manpower and finances being spent by the on campus compliance administrators to send these notifications could be better applied elsewhere.

Some may argue that sending these notifications assists in the monitoring of the five visit limit for each prospect. However, I think it's fair to say that few if any compliance administrators know exactly how many other official visits a prospect has taken, or will take, when this notification is sent.

The Division I membership eliminated this requirement in 2004. Per the NCAA enforcement staff, there have been no violations reported in Divisions I or II involving a prospect making more than five official visits since January 1, 2004.

Further research shows the same result to be true at least as far back as January 1, 2000. And it is possible that none have been reported even prior to that.

In order to reduce some of the administrative burden placed on our already overworked compliance personnel, and to eliminate unnecessary paperwork and inadvertent secondary violations, we urge your support of Proposal No. 10.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 3.

**Jared Mosley (Abilene Christian University):** Mr. Chair, Jerry Mosley, Abilene Christian University, athletics director. I stand to speak today in support of Proposal No. 10.

This past fall the Lone Star Conference compiled a survey that provides compelling evidence as to why no violations are being reported. We surveyed student athletes at our 15 member institutions in 16 different sports, eight men's and eight women's, to find out how many official visits each student athlete was offered, and then how many of those were taken.

The survey included 367 student athletes in all, with a possible five official visits per student athlete. The survey participants had a maximum of 1,835 official visit opportunities. Yet they received only 616 combined offers for visits and took a total of just 232 official visits.

Of the 367 student athletes, none of them took five official visits. Only eight of them reported taking as many as four official visits. And there were another 32 of them who took three official visits.

Perhaps the most telling statistic is that 183 student athletes, or 49.9 percent of those surveyed, took no official visit at all. So nearly half of the survey participants never took an official visit, while 89.1 percent took less than three official visits.

The logical deduction from this research is that any resources being spent by your compliance administrators to send notification letters could be better applied elsewhere. It is for that reason that I urge you to support Proposal No. 10.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Webbe:** Frank Webbe, faculty athletics representative, Florida Institute of Technology, and member of the FARA Executive Committee. On behalf of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I am in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 10.

FARA opposes this proposal because it places paperwork and e mail reduction in a superior position to student athlete well-being.

If the current requirement is removed, there will be no institutional responsibility for informing a prospective student athlete of the five visit limit, which has the potential to create more, rather than fewer violations.

For these reasons, we ask you to please join FARA in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 10.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Ms. Nee:** Frances Nee, associate athletics director, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, member of the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 10.

Current legislation requires institutions to provide written notice of the five official visit limitation to prospective student athletes at the time of the invitation to the official visit and before they arrive to campus for the start of the visit. Adoption of this proposal would eliminate this written notice requirement, and thus prospective student athletes would no longer be educated about the five visit limitation.

Without proper education by the member institutions, prospective student athletes run the risk of taking more than five official visits and being in violation of the legislation.

It is our responsibility to educate prospective student athletes about all facets of the legislation. Providing written notice of the five visit limitation is not so cumbersome that it warrants placing the burden on our prospective student athletes.

For these reasons, I strongly urge your opposition to Proposal No. 2010 10.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Ms. Jennifer Chow (California Collegiate Athletic Association):** Good morning. My name is Jennifer Chow from the California Collegiate Athletic Association, and I'm a member of the National Student Athlete Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

The Division II SAAC opposes Proposal No. 10 for the following reasons:

Prospective student athletes rely on the information provided to them by the recruiting institution to understand NCAA legislation. By removing the written notice of the official visit, it would eliminate the written notification to the prospect that they can only take five official visits to Division I and II institutions.

The prospect could exceed the five visit limitation without ever knowing that the limitation existed and therefore be in violation of the legislation.

This proposal would not decrease the administrative duties of the institution. The institution would still be required to monitor the five visit limitation legislation, but the prospect will not have the benefit of the written notification.

Institutions should make every effort to assist the prospect in understanding and following NCAA legislation. The five visit letter is one way that institutions assist and notify prospects of the requirement. We oppose the elimination of this written notification, and we encourage you to oppose this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference):** Steve Murray, commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Not speaking in opposition or support of 2010 10, but perhaps the conversation in our conference has been that the Eligibility Center could be seen as a place that could develop a monitoring of this documentation for the student athlete, as well as the institution. You can't take an official visit unless you're registered at the Eligibility Center. Could there be five drop down menus, that institutions could go in, fill out their institution's name, and that way the kid can go look, "Oh, I used my five," and every other institution in the country can see where those five have been used?

So it might be something that the Presidents Council goes along with, one way or the other, for a way to handle all the documentation and monitoring of student athlete involvement in the process.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 3.

**Stan Wagnon (Lone Star Conference):** Good morning. Stan Wagnon, commissioner of the Lone Star Conference. I want to speak in support of Proposal No. 10.

The opposition to this proposal has said that eliminating the letter won't relieve an administrative burden because compliance administrators will still be required to monitor this rule.

I'm curious to know what other actions compliance administrators are taking to actively monitor this rule. The reason I say that is, in the conversations we've had in sponsoring this legislation, I'm afraid that we've sent the message that, by requiring to send this letter, that that's all the action that's required to monitor this rule.

Therefore, a key benefit to this proposal is that it sends a clear message to the coaches, to the compliance administrators, that to monitor is more than just to send a letter. In fact, sending a letter is probably better classified as more of an educational effort, than it is monitoring.

There's nothing wrong with educating prospects about the official visit restrictions, but I would argue the one visit per institution limitation is a much more important aspect of this rule, than the five visit-per-prospect restriction. So in effect, I believe our current practice is to send a letter, educating prospects on the least significant part of the official visit legislation.

I support this proposal because I think our compliance administrators have plenty more important items to monitor, items related to our coaching staffs and current student athletes, whose possible wrongdoing might actually bring harm to an individual or an institution.

I ask you this: If a prospect takes six official visits, who does that harm? Who gains the advantage? Who gets cheated? In the example I just listed, all six schools would get the exact same opportunity to recruit that prospect.

That's why I believe the one visit per institution limitation is much more significant. Yet we don't have a requirement to send a letter about that.

To be clear, I'm not up here telling you that our compliance administrators shouldn't be monitoring prospects. Instead, I'm hoping to shed light on two things: first, that sending a letter is not an act of monitoring; and second, the fact that we have more pressing needs for our compliance administrators to monitor.

That said, if this proposal is to fail, I respectfully invite the Division II governance structure and/or the Eligibility Center to take up this issue and bring forward another way to educate prospects in this area, without requiring the services of our on campus compliance administrators. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Carol Rivera (California Collegiate Athletics Association):** Carol Rivera, assistant commissioner, California Collegiate Athletic Association, member of the Legislation Committee. On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 10.

Providing written notice regarding the five visit limitation is not an administrative burden. Institutions are required to monitor a prospective student athlete's visit to their institution, and the written notification is the first step in that monitoring process. If the written notice requirement is eliminated, there will be no less administrative burden, as all other aspects of an official visit must still be tracked and recorded.

In addition, institutions have the liberty to provide written notice in many forms, including e mail. There is no simpler task than attaching a document in an e mail to the prospective student athlete. This communication also provides athletic administrators an opportunity to make contact with prospective student athletes prior to their visit, which gives the prospective student athletes another point of contact at the institution.

For these reasons, and those previously stated, I urge you to oppose this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Does anyone else wish to speak to Proposal No. 10? If not, we are now ready to vote on the merits of Proposal No. 10 by a roll call vote.

It is now time to decide Proposal No. 10. Use your voting machine to cast your vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please cast your vote.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 10 is adopted.

Proposal No. 11 deals with the area of eligibility and is a roll call vote. I refer you to the green procedural issues document, Page No. 5, Item No. 9, for the noncontroversial legislative amendment to Proposal No. 11 that has been adopted by the Management Council.

The proposal amends the effective date to August 1, 2010, for individuals who are issued a final certification by the NCAA Eligibility Center on or after April 1, 2010.

Microphone No. 3.

**Joseph “Pat” O’Brien (West Texas A&M University):** My name is Pat O’Brien, president, West Texas A&M University, Lone Star Conference, and member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2010 11.

**Mr. Jordan:** It’s been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 3.

**Mr. O’Brien:** Before moving to the merits of the proposal, I believe some background information on the history of the organized competition prior to initial collegiate enrollment legislation would be helpful in providing a better understanding of how Proposal No. 2010 11 addresses the membership’s concerns regarding the current rule.

The current organized competition rule was adopted at the 2001 NCAA Convention. The rule focuses on competitive equity issues when an individual delays initial collegiate enrollment after high school graduation and participates in any activity that meets the definition of “organized competition.”

The current definition specifies that compensation, including actual and necessary expenses, is a means by which to determine whether competition is organized. This current definition of “organized competition” has been a concern and a challenge for the membership.

From 2001 through 2006, institutions applied the legislation on campus. During that period, the membership, once again, raised concerns about the eligibility status of domestic and international prospective student athletes because institutions came to different conclusions or certification under the rule.

At the 2006 NCAA Convention, the membership adopted a proposal to require institutions to use a clearinghouse, or Eligibility Center as it is now referred, to certify the amateur status of prospective student athletes initially enrolling at Division II institutions.

Thereafter, the NCAA Eligibility Center began completing certification for individuals enrolling at Division II institutions on or after August 1, 2007. Within the first academic year in which certifications were issued by a central body, institutional requests for a waiver of the organized competition legislation increased by 400 percent.

Since January 2008, the governance structure has been working toward the development of a proposal to amend the organized competition rule. Proposal No. 2010 11 addresses the membership’s concern regarding the current definition of “organized competition” and eliminates compensation from the analysis of whether an individual participates in organized competition during a delay period between high school graduation and initial full time collegiate enrollment.

Rather than using compensation, issues like whether an official score is maintained, uniforms are used and teams or other individual statistics are maintained will be used to determine whether the activity is organized competition.

This new definition will focus on the frequency and level of competition. It will, undoubtedly, cast a wider net. But it is simpler and provides a consistent means of applying the rule. It is also easier to explain and educate coaches, institutions and, most importantly, prospective student athletes.

The current rule is difficult to apply and interpret. Essentially, many have said that it’s broken. However, the original intent of the legislation is preserved in Proposal No. 2010 11 because it focuses on maintaining a level playing field, while addressing the competitive advantage that can be gained by an individual who delays college, to participate in his or her sport.

This proposal may not be perfect, but it is a compromise made by our various stakeholder groups. It will require a fundamental philosophical shift, but these are positive changes for coaches, prospective student athletes and our member institutions.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 2010 11.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Herb Reinhard (Valdosta State University):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Herb Reinhard, director of athletics at Valdosta State University and a member of the Management Council.

On behalf of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 2010 11. The organized competition prior to initial collegiate enrollment legislation has been the focus of discussion for the past several years. While this proposal amends the organized competition rules, it does not stray from the membership’s desire to address the competitive advantage that is gained by an individual who delays collegiate enrollment.

Proposal No. 2010 11 outlines four significant changes to the current organized competition rules.

The first change is an expansion of the grace period to one calendar year; second, the definition of “organized competition” will establish much clearer conditions for triggering the application of the rule; thirdly, the proposal sets forth an exception to the academic year in residence that is required when an individual participates in organized competition, and thus is charged with a season or seasons of competition; and finally the rule would be restructured to assist the membership and prospective student athletes with understanding the rule.

The current legislation provides prospective student athletes with a grace period between high school graduation and the individual’s first opportunity to enroll in a collegiate institution. This proposal will expand the grace period from a summer, or a couple of weeks for an individual who graduates from high school in the Southern Hemisphere, to one calendar year. As an example, an individual who graduates from high school in June 2010 will be able to participate in organized com-

petition until the fall term of 2011, without triggering the application of the rule. After fall 2011, if the individual continues his or her participation in organized competition, he or she will be charged with a season or seasons of competition and be required to serve an academic year in residence.

The expanded grace period will likely benefit a prospective student athlete who is having a difficult time making a decision on his or her future. Sometimes our young men and women don't know if college is attainable at their first opportunity following high school graduation. Perhaps these prospective student athletes cannot afford the cost of attending a collegiate institution and choose to delay enrollment by one calendar year or need to work and save money for a year before enrolling in their collegiate institution.

Many times during this one year calendar period, an individual wants to continue to compete on his or her basketball team or swim club with their friends. I don't agree that these prospective student athletes should be charged a season of competition for their participation in organized competition while they are making their decision on collegiate enrollment.

Under the current rule, an individual who is charged with a season of competition must sit for an academic year in residence upon enrolling at a Division II institution. This proposal establishes an exception to the year in residence if an individual attended a two year or four year college for at least two full time semesters or three full time quarters and has satisfactorily completed an average of 12 hours of transferrable degree credit for each full time academic year term of attendance. By meeting this exception, the transfer student has demonstrated his or her commitment to academics, which is the intent of the academic year in residence. The individual will still be charged with a season or seasons of competition, but will not be required to serve the academic year in residence.

For these reasons and the reasons previously stated, I ask you to join me in support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Higgins:** Thank you, Dr. Jordan. Kelly Higgins, athletics director, Fort Lewis College.

I read from my transcript from a week ago.

What has been the rationale behind going this route? It's too hard to prove that an individual has technically been a pro. There was a 400 percent increase in appeals, and there has been a rise in the number of violations in this area in the last few years. I'm sorry, but going from 12 to 48 appeals is not a reason to change one of our defining core, philosophical advantages as a division. Stating it is too hard to prove someone guilty is not a reason to assume all are guilty and that we all have to prove ourselves innocent. I think we all know how hard that is.

The U.S. judicial system is set up with this philosophy, to ensure, to the best of our ability, that the innocent have the best opportunity to prevail.

Much like that philosophy, I would prefer that a few guilty escape the clutches of our eligibility rules than to eliminate the opportunity for almost all individuals past that normal college range of 18 to 23 to participate in Division II. Stating that we've had an increase in the number of violations in this area the last few years is not a sound rationale for such drastic change. Schools decide who they wish to recruit. It also tells me this process is actually working.

I was there with many of you some time ago when the existing rule was being fine tuned into its present form. The goal, at least in my mind at that time, was to ensure proven professionals were recognized, if possible, and that actions were taken to try and reduce the flow of said student athletes into Division II, or to reduce the impact of their presence. I, and the others with me, did not expect it to be easy. We expected it to be hard because it should be. That's a good thing.

If we, as a division, want to eliminate this clearly defining window of opportunity that does not exist in Division I, and for all practical purposes does not exist in Division III, then we're making a drastic philosophical change in this division. In fact, I would suggest this type of drastic change violates some of the very core values we identify in that philosophy statement.

Many of our institutions in these difficult economic times like to recruit older students. Some of them like to participate in athletics. But if we pass this bylaw in its present form, we will be creating a de facto age rule, and we will eliminate most, if not all, older student athletes from even trying to participate in the future of Division II.

Is that what we really want? Not me. Do we want to be like and compete directly for student athletes with Division I again? Not me. I don't think so.

The last time this came up for discussion, I stated I didn't want to have to tell a 50 year old rifleman he couldn't come back to our campus to play because he just happened to play a little bit over the course of his lifetime, and because it's measured, it counted, in a recreational activity.

We've set the bar way too low here. We are Division II. I like that. Our lack of an age rule is not only an advantage for us as a division, it is a student friendly, nondiscriminatory initiative that actually recognizes today's older demographic profile and helps some of us enhance our enrollment.

I urge each of you to vote against this proposal. The current process is working. If it needs to be refined, let's go down that path. Let the learning curve continue to take effect, and the numbers of appeals and violations will decrease.

I urge you to take the time to review the ramifications of this change. If you do, I think you will reach the same conclusion as I. We must not take action that will clearly change the definition of this division by enacting what I firmly believe is an age

rule. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 3.

**Keith Vitense (Cameron University):** Thank you. Keith Vitense, faculty athletics representative, Cameron University, and a member of the FARA Executive Committee.

On behalf of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I stand in support of Proposal No. 2010 11. Going a little bit off script, it's kind of difficult to prepare these in advance because you don't know who would have spoken before you and what points have been made, so please allow me the indulgence of maybe restating some of the points that were made earlier.

This proposal would not only make it easier for prospective student athletes to accurately determine if they have competed in an activity that would count as organized competition but would also allow for more equitable treatment for prospective student athletes who graduate from a high school system that uses a different academic calendar than the more traditional fall/spring calendar.

Further, this will give prospective student athletes more time to determine that they want to pursue a collegiate education, will include the provision that prospective student athletes be informed of the organized competition legislation and, perhaps most importantly, provide that waiver process to allow those prospective student athletes who demonstrate extenuating circumstances relief from the legislation.

I urge you to join FARA in support of this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Alex Molotsky (Northeast 10 Conference):** Good morning. My name is Alex Molotsky from the Northeast 10 Conference, and I'm a member of the National Student Athlete Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 11 for the following reasons:

The current organized competition legislation is often confusing and difficult for prospective student athletes to understand what activities subject them to the legislation. This proposal provides a clear definition of "organized competition" and the activities that subject a prospect to the legislation.

In addition, this proposal would provide a grace period that would benefit both domestic and international prospective student athletes. The grace period allows the prospect ample time to make decisions about enrollment in college, while participating in organized competition, without jeopardizing their eligibility.

We believe that although the definition of "organized competition" is broader, expanding the grace period and requiring institutions to notify the prospect will assist prospects in protecting their eligibility. Overall, it will continue to ensure competitive equity among institutions in Division II.

We encourage you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Sharon Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania):** Sharon Taylor, director of athletics at Lock Haven University.

I really have a concern about this legislation. I think there needs to be some middle ground, someplace between where we were and where this is trying to take us. I'm really concerned I think it's great if there's a student who graduates from high school, and then can sit and contemplate for a year or two what he or she wants to do. I think the reality is that more students don't go on to college immediately, usually because there's an economic reason.

And I think that by taking the list of things there that determines competitive that triggers the competitive issue, any one of those hardly can be avoided if a student continues to be active at all.

If a kid goes to a YMCA and plays in a couple of games where they keep score, I don't know many that play games that don't keep score, or if they go and play in a recreational volleyball league at the YMCA or at some other kind of community organization.

In my own sport, I know that if a kid plays on a weekend field hockey league for five weeks in the fall, that's hardly organized. I mean, that's about as organized as the Democratic Party (*laughter*). And so to take that and to say that has triggered competition, really is a low standard.

But I seriously am really concerned about the list that's there. It's hard, when a young person who has an economic reason for not being able to matriculate, could hardly get away from triggering it, and therefore lose seasons of competition if he or she is able to go to college.

**Mr. Jordan:** Are there any Democrats that want a rebuttal (*laughter*)?

Does anyone else wish to speak to Proposal No. 11? If not, it is now time to decide Proposal No. 11.

Whoops. I'm sorry.

**Mr. O'Brien:** Whoa. Whoa, Steve.

**Mr. Jordan:** You've got to be faster there, Mr. President. Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. O'Brien:** Pat O'Brien, president, West Texas A&M University, member of the Management Council.

It's been argued that this proposal is a disguise for an age rule. That's not true.

The mission of many of our institutions, as we well know, specifying that we are committed to providing access to higher education for nontraditional students. That includes older students, older students who took time out to marry, have children, serve their country, or do many other things prior to enrolling full time at one of our colleges or universities.

The proposed expanded grace period under the organized competition prior to collegiate enrollment legislation will still provide opportunity for this type of nontraditional student athlete to enroll and participate in intercollegiate athletics at our institutions.

Actually, the expanded grace period will benefit all potential student athletes, especially those who may have a difficult time with the costs associated with attending college. All prospective student athletes will have the benefit of one calendar year to make decisions that impact their future.

Finally, Proposal No. 2010 11 will not prevent a student athlete from enrolling at a collegiate institution immediately at his or her first opportunity following high school graduation. This is consistent with our philosophy in Division II. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Anyone else wish to speak to Proposal No. 11?

It is now time to decide Proposal No. 11. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 11 is adopted.

Proposal No. 12 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010.

Microphone No. 6.

**Bob Fortosis (Eckerd College):** Yes, good morning. My name is Bob Fortosis, director of athletics at Eckerd College, member of the Sunshine State Conference and the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 2010 12.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Fortosis:** Adopting this proposal will put in place financial aid, playing and practice seasons, and sports sponsorship requirements for sand volleyball.

As you may recall at the 2009 Convention, the Division II membership adopted a proposal that added sand volleyball to the list of emerging sports for women. According to the emerging sports timetable legislation, the membership must vote on recruiting, financial aid and sports sponsorship requirements in the first year after a sport has been added to the list of emerging sports.

This proposal creates what is called a hierarchy financial aid model. Any student athlete who receives athletics aid and participates in sand volleyball and volleyball would count against the volleyball equivalency, regardless of how the financial aid agreement is written.

This eliminates the possibility that institutions could offer sand volleyball financial aid to student athletes who are primarily volleyball student athletes. In addition, the proposal establishes a maximum equivalency of five for sand volleyball.

The playing and practice seasons legislation closely mirrors that of other spring championship sports. Institutions and student athletes may participate in a maximum of 16 dates of competition during the championship segment and four dates of competition during the nonchampionship segment.

The minimum contest and sports sponsorship requirements are written in a manner designed to establish sand volleyball as a separate and distinct sport from indoor volleyball. To count sand volleyball as a sport for sponsorship purposes, an institution must play three or more dual meet contests, in which all five two person teams participate.

An additional option to meet the eight contest minimum for sports sponsorship would allow an institution to participate in tournaments where all five two person teams compete and a team champion is crowned.

It's important to note that adoption of this proposal does not require institutions to sponsor the sport of sand volleyball at the varsity level, as institutions have the discretion to determine if sand volleyball is a viable option for its athletics program. This proposal simply establishes the legislation for the sport.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Does anyone else wish to speak to Proposal No. 12? If not, it is now time for our paddle vote on Proposal No. 12.

All in favor, please raise your paddle; all opposed, please raise your paddle; abstaining, please raise your paddle.

Proposal No. 12 is adopted.

Proposal No. 13 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010. This is a membership sponsored proposal, sponsored by the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference.

Microphone No. 6.

**Joel "J.R." Smith (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference):** Thank you, Dr. Jordan. J.R. Smith, commissioner, Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference. And on behalf of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and my good friends at the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference, I wish to move 2010 13.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Smith:** This proposal would benefit student athletes in the sport of golf by spreading out the nonchampionship segment and allowing them to avoid missing class time for several weeks in a row. This change would not increase missed class time because the 24 days of practice and competition in the nonchampionship segment would not increase, and most institutions already compete in four or five tournaments during that segment.

For those reasons, we wish that you would support this proposal. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Does anyone else wish to speak to Proposal No. 13? If not, it is now time to decide Proposal No. 13.

Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 13 is adopted.

Proposal No. 14 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2010. This is a membership sponsored proposal, sponsored by the Peach Belt Conference and the Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Bryant:** Mr. Chair, I'm Clint Bryant, director of athletics at Augusta State University. On behalf of the Peach Belt Conference, Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 14.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Bryant:** It's been a long morning, and I know that some delegates might be thinking, "Here we go again," but this is good legislation for our division and its sponsors.

After serious study of the issue, we feel there are more compelling arguments to this proposal than just the start date and worthy of another look by our membership. If you recall, last year this proposal was defeated by 11 votes.

Currently, an institution shall not play its first contest against outside competition prior to November the 15th, aside from exemptions outlined in Bylaw 17.3.3.1. This proposal does not change that date substantially, as you will hear later. It simply allows institutions to schedule their first contest on a weekend. Changes in start date to the second Friday, instead of the 15th, has many benefits, including that the basketball season will always begin on a Friday, and it allows for season opening events, such as conference challenges and community engagement activities to be implemented.

Proposal No. 14 will not allow an institution to compete earlier than what is allowed under current legislation, as most Division II basketball teams compete in exempted contests on or soon after November 1.

This proposal will only change the date for the first permissible countable contest and provides a benefit to our student athletes as no season-opening contest will take place during the week, and by allowing the flexibility to schedule both conference and nonconference countable contests at a time, so as not to interfere with final examination periods.

We urge your support of Proposal No. 14.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Ms. Pitts:** Beverley Pitts, University of Indianapolis, and member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 2010 14.

Current legislation offers a consistent start date for the first contest in basketball of November 15, regardless of the day on which November 15 occurs. Proposal No. 2010 14 would amend the first contest date to begin no earlier than the second Friday of November.

What this means is that each institution would have to determine the start date on campus, which in turn opens up a greater possibility for misapplication of the rule.

Finally, by adopting Proposal No. 2010 14, you would be agreeing to lengthen the regular playing season in basketball, which is contrary to the Life in the Balance package.

For these reasons, I strongly urge your opposition to 2010 14.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 6.

**Ann Martin [Regis University (Colorado)]:** Ann Martin, associate director of athletics, SWA, at Regis University, and member of the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal.

As President Pitts just mentioned, it clearly lengthens the length of the playing season, while reducing the number of days

that are available for the preseason practice period. This is contrary to the direction that the Life in the Balance initiative is heading.

In addition, it is a fact that some institutions like to schedule their competitions on weekdays, rather than weekends, because their personnel and students are on campus to be part of those events.

Finally, as you all remember, and was stated before, we have voted on this proposal in the two previous years, and at the 2008 Convention it was defeated by more than 175 votes. So, clearly, the membership has spoken.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Rob Capehart (West Liberty University):** Yes. My name is Rob Capehart, and I'm the president of West Liberty University, and we're a member of the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Let me just start by telling you something real briefly about our school, which may reflect a lot of the schools that are in this room, a lot of institutions that are in this room.

We recruit very heavily out of northern West Virginia, out of Ohio and out of western Pennsylvania. Those are areas which have seen significant declines economically over about the past 20 to 30 years. As a result, what our institution does, and I think a lot of institutions in our area do, is they provide our student athletes with the opportunity to become the first members of their family to get a college degree. And let me tell you something, there's nothing that makes you more proud than watching the family members of those institutions come down two times: No. 1, to watch their child participate in basketball, in this particular case; and No. 2, during graduation. And not in that order, by the way.

What we have in the situation here is we have a proposal that does one thing. It allows you to move a game from a weekday to a weekend, when those families can come and watch their student athlete participate in a basketball game. That's all it does.

I remember last year when this was being discussed, one of the concerns was, "Well, it will be confusing." Well, we've managed, with the 70 Ph.D.s on our campus and the people with a master's degree to determine that we vote the Tuesday following the second Monday of the year, and we can figure out when the second Friday of November is. We're very, very competent in that.

By moving it to a weekend, not only does it allow our families to spend the afternoon, not just to come to the game, but come to the game beforehand, spend the afternoon, spend the evening with their family and travel back home. Keep in mind, this is a lot of people that live two and three hours away. I know it's probably even worse in a lot of other areas, who can't come down every weekend to watch a game.

Weekend games mean less missed class time, which I believe is one of the emphasis that I've heard mentioned over and over again. And when you talk about practices, and you talk about game days, at the end of the day for our student athletes, basketball season begins on October 15 when they walk out on that court and begin to practice with their teammates. That's when basketball season begins. It ends when they walk off the floor after their last regular season or last tournament game.

In between that time, it doesn't lengthen the playing season. If you want to lengthen the playing season, add another game or expand the time in which you can play. This doesn't do that. All this does is move a game to a weekend.

It allows us, especially in the winter, to avoid conflicts with final examinations. And in order to get a game in on this weekend, which many of you may have had the same problem in December, we had to schedule a game on the same day as commencement, and it was an away game.

So there's those types of conflicts that take place on schedule, in addition to class time, that we think more accurately reflects our mission and our determination to live Life in the Balance.

I've tried to address a couple of the concerns. One thing I heard about, and I heard last time, too, was overlap. "Well, you might overlap with football season." Well, let me tell you something. We're very proud that for the first time in the history of our institution this year, we made the NCAA Division II playoffs. It just so happened that we had the opportunity to host that playoff game, and we got to host it on a day, not just a day that we had a home basketball game scheduled, but on the same weekend that we had a basketball tournament scheduled. Four games to be played.

Our athletic department responded tremendously. Let me tell you what happened. On Friday, our alumni and our supporters from the community, they flowed into our community for that weekend. On Friday night they got to see our basketball team score 149 points in a game. They stayed for the football game, in which the two teams combined for 147 points and 1,390 yards of offense in a titanic defensive struggle, obviously. That Saturday night they got to see us play our rival, the rival team that we look forward to playing every year.

I've never seen so much excitement on our campus as there was on that weekend. So I don't really believe that overlap is an issue when it comes to that.

Hopefully, I've made my point. The fact is, that this is good for intercollegiate athletics. We know that it's good for our campus. We know that it's good for our student athletes. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Jordan:** Well, we'll know in a moment whether you made your point, but we sure know that you can roll up the points

on the athletic field, so  
Microphone No. 2.

**Brooke Baker (Pacific West Conference):** Good morning. My name is Brooke Baker from the Pacific West Conference. I'm a member of the National Student Athlete Advisory Committee, speaking on behalf of all Division II student athletes.

The Division II SAAC opposes Proposal No. 14 for the following reasons:

This proposal will shorten the preseason practice period for basketball student athletes and will increase the length of the regular playing season. The preseason practice period is an important time for student athletes to prepare for the rigorous basketball season.

In addition, the length of the regular playing season will adversely affect the academic performance of basketball student athletes by increasing time away from campus.

Since this legislation will result in an earlier start date, the basketball season would cause additional overlap with fall sports, thus further limiting facility availability for student athletes. Limited facilities are already a problem on many campuses, and this proposal would increase the pressure on already limited resources.

We encourage you to oppose this proposal.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 3.

**Randall Williams (Texas A&M University Kingsville):** Howdy there, Mr. Chairman. I'm Randall Williams, faculty athletics representative from the University of Texas A&M in Kingsville and a proud member of the Lone Star Conference.

I want to speak in support of Proposal No. 14 and the benefit it could bring to our conference from an academic standpoint and a Life in the Balance perspective.

Under current legislation, most years there are 15 weekends in the basketball season. For the Lone Star Conference, just like many other conferences who play 20 to 22 conference contests, the conference schedule utilizes 11 of those 15 weekends. Of the four remaining weekends on our conference schedule, one has been eliminated with this morning's approval of the winter break; one is the first available weekend to the season, which is a prime opportunity for nonconference competition; one occurs on Thanksgiving weekend; and the last one often occurs on New Year's holiday.

At present, our conference plays six conference contests in the month of December. There's no way to keep those from conflicting with final exams, commencement ceremonies and the like.

The real benefit of Proposal No. 14 is that it ensures an extra weekend in the month of November. With that extra weekend, our conference could move two of the December contests to help reduce conflicts with final exams and fall commencement ceremonies.

I know that it has been said that more basketball games in November might equate to more conflicts with fall sports, such as football and volleyball. But if we're talking about finding a true balance that allows students to work on the student side of being a student athlete, I think that balance can be found in giving conflicts with final exams more consideration, than conflicts with other sports.

Most athletics departments already have facility and staffing conflicts with sports seasons that overlap, and academic administrators find a way to make it work. It's their job.

Let's approve Proposal No. 14 and give conferences the option to schedule in a way that allows student athletes to perform better during final exam periods. It's all you all's responsibility. Trust me. I'm a doctor (*laughter*).

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 5.

**Mr. Lane:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Michael Lane, president of Emporia State, and proud member of the Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association. I rise to speak in favor of Proposal No. 14.

As has been alluded to by several previous speakers, there seems to be a significant amount of misinformation, or at least misinterpretation of information, regarding this proposal that I would like to clear up.

First, the sponsors have been told by some delegates that they believe this proposal shortens the length of the preseason practice period. You've already heard the reality that we play exempted games after the 1st of November, so that argument really is made moot by the fact that we permit those exempted games on the 1st of November. The season practice is already shortened by the existence of those games.

Much of the opposition seems to be centered on the premise that the proposal would cause the basketball season to begin a week earlier than is presently permissible, and therefore shorten the preseason practice season. Actually, this would only occur three times over the next 15 years, as that second Friday would occur on the eighth day of November.

The reality is, the change would affect the start date by an average of 4.4 days over that same 15 year period.

We're simply, as you've heard before, and most importantly, adding a weekend to the basketball schedule, to permit the first contest or set of contest tournaments to occur on a weekend.

I can tell you that my basketball coaches have not missed the first day of eligible play in my short tenure, nor for the 10 years prior to my arrival at the university.

We've just shortened the contestability by seven days with the moratorium in December. That is going to push one more

game to a weekday if we don't open this weekend opportunity up.

Presidents and conferences have the ability to control the schedule during the weeks. This allows another weekend to schedule contests, so that that additional game that we just pushed out of the seven day window can move to a weekend.

Next, the sponsors have been told by some delegates that they believe the proposal will increase the overall length of the entire playing season. Again, while, on average, increasing the playing season 4.4 days, the real benefit is that we add a weekend for the opportunity to play one or two games, and moving those games out of times when classes are in session and out of times when students would have to travel and miss that class time.

Delegates need to understand that the statement, "We're adding weeks to the season," is not accurate. It reflects an alarmist mentality. We're adding a weekend, a Friday, a Saturday and a Sunday, to permit students the opportunity to play when classes are not in session, and as you heard so eloquently, to permit families of students to attend those games and cheer on their sons and daughters as they play basketball. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 5.

**Mr. Axtell:** Darrell Axtell, St. Martin's University, member of the Legislative Review Committee of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association. I stand in opposition to 2010 14.

FARA opposes this legislation on the grounds that have been stated previously. I urge you to join FARA in opposition to this proposition.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Murray:** Steve Murray, commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Debating on one side or the other, I don't think Division II needs to have its two premier sports, ending its regular season with football, and basketball starting the regular season, on the same weekend. Not so much for student athlete balance, but perhaps athletic trainers, sports information, those kind of things that occur on the campuses, as well. Their life in the balance is also important, as well.

So, I know the debate. November 8 is earlier than November 15, no matter how you look at it, no matter how many days you count. But let's not have the regular season of some of our premier sports occurring on the same weekend.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 2.

**Jim Johnson (Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association):** Mr. Chair, Jim Johnson, commissioner of the Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association. On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 14.

It is correct that this proposal was defeated two years ago by 175 votes. It's also true it was defeated last year. As my colleague from the Peach Belt stated, that margin last year was only 11 votes.

The sponsors request that delegates please vote based on the merits of this proposal, not just because this is the third time and some delegates are tired of the discussion. Please vote on the valuable information you've received this weekend and heard this morning.

There are two key points that have been previously alluded to. We are not starting the season earlier. The basketball season starts October 15. Institutions are already playing after that date, prior to November 15. This year Division II played 518 basketball games prior to November 15.

We understand that will be part of Phase 2, to look at exemptions, and we look forward to that discussion next year.

No. 2, lastly, and maybe most importantly, please understand that this is permissive legislation. You do not have to play on the second Friday. If you believe playing on November 15 or 16 or 20, or if you prefer weekday games, and that is a better plan for your institution, you can do that.

This is permissible legislation that assists conferences that have a significant number of conference games. Those conferences will have an additional weekend for scheduling to avoid final exams, holiday periods, etc.

Maybe it is a good thing this has been defeated in the past, as the continued study and discussion has magnified why this option is very valuable. Adoption of Proposal No. 7 this morning makes this option even more important. I urge your support.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Bryant:** This is Clint Bryant, director of athletics at Augusta State University, again.

As my colleagues who speak in support of this have so eloquently described, this is good legislation. The bottom line is this: We are already playing basketball on November the 1st. As Jim said, some 540 competitions before the 15th. So the argument about football and basketball overlapping, we're already playing games.

A lot of those games are very lucrative for Division II institutions because we get to play our Division I colleagues for guarantees. So we are playing basketball.

This past year, November 15 fell on a Sunday. Now, are we talking about Life in the Balance? I would love to have my athletic training staff, sports information staff and other support staff have a Sunday with their families, instead of playing a basketball game that I could have played on Friday or Saturday.

The other thing, with all due respect to my Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee, and the governance structure, the thing that is different now in our Association, is that anytime we have membership driven good

legislation, it is overshadowed by the governance structure coming in opposition of what we think is good legislation.

Once upon a time in this Association, membership driven legislation was the day. That's what we did. And I think this is good legislation.

Now, the opposition that you have presented is simply untrue, unfactual. We've done our research. We've come back with the facts. I urge your support of this legislation.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Mr. Salant:** Nate Salant, commissioner of the Gulf South Conference.

Clint, you and I go back a long ways, and I respect your opinions and value them, but I think that one piece of research that has been brought to your attention is not completely revealed.

I would like to know the number of these games that occur during that November 1 through 14 time frame that are home games for Division II schools. It's my understanding that almost all of those games are either at Division I's for guarantees or at the Disney Classics.

So we would, in fact, be increasing the loads on those very same sports information directors, certified athletic trainers and administrators who Clint and others would like to have a Sunday off at the start of the season, which I can certainly understand.

I don't want SIDs, athletic trainers, other staff people, staffing a football game on the second weekend of November, and with the new legislation, the third weekend of November, and then having to deal with home basketball tournaments where it's not only one extra game, but sometimes it's two and sometimes it's four. So I think you have to see the full picture.

Now, if the information I have is incorrect, and most of these games that already take place are, in fact, home Division II games on your campuses, I'll certainly be glad to be corrected. But that's not my understanding of the situation as it is. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 3.

**Mr. Mosley:** Jared Mosley, director of athletics, Abilene Christian University. I'm standing here as a former Division II basketball student athlete, coach and current administrator to speak to the value of having flexibility.

Nobody in this room is being mandated to start on that Friday or Saturday. I will say in conferences with a large number of conference games that must be played, from a student athlete perspective, it is difficult twice a year to play three basketball games in one week. It's a student athlete welfare issue that alleviates it provides flexibility. It's not a mandate.

I understand that, you know, the exhibition games, those take place. I don't know the data as far as what's home, what's away. But I know on most of our campuses, one of those is away at a Division I institution. A lot of those are home contests that we're playing with other Division III's and different institutions that are in our proximity.

So, again, it's flexibility. It's not a mandate. If for your conference, your institution, it works better to stick to the 15th, that's great. But for those of us who have larger conferences, it gives us a benefit, and it benefits our student athletes. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Does anyone Microphone No. 6.

**Joan McDermott (Metropolitan State College of Denver):** Joan McDermott, Metro State College of Denver. Thank you, Dr. Jordan.

The one sport that no one has talked about is volleyball. That weekend is the last weekend of the regular season for volleyball. So you would either have a lot of conference matches at home, or you would have a conference tournament. I would hate to see volleyball overshadowed by starting the first weekend of basketball. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Does anyone else wish to speak to Proposal No. 14? If not, it is now time to decide Proposal No. 14.

Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

Proposal No. 14 is defeated.

First of all, congratulations on Phase 1. We've completed our initial voting. I want to thank all of you for your patience.

I would now like to open the window of reconsideration for all of the proposals we just considered. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of any proposal may move for a reconsideration. We will pause for just a few moments to give delegates who want, a chance to organize, and then I will open the floor for reconsiderations.

During our brief intermission, we will view the 2009 highlight video.

*(Playing of video clip.)*

**Mr. Jordan:** Will the Convention please come back to order. We will now consider any reconsiderations.

Microphone No. 3.

**Dan Mara (Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference):** Dr. Jordan, Dan Mara, commissioner of the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference. I voted on the prevailing side of 2010 14, and I ask that it be opened for reconsideration.

**Mr. Jordan:** It's been moved and seconded.

Microphone No. 3, do you have any further comments?

**Keith Bullion (Salem International University):** Yes. Thanks. This is Keith Bullion, athletics director, Salem International University. I also voted "no" in the prevailing. However, I would like, at least, as we consider this, moving forward, that institutions who are in conferences that are not affected by the large number, take into consideration the possibility that maybe an abstention would be a better vote for them.

Having been an administrator at a school that has hosted both an east regional football tournament and a basketball tournament at the same time, it is a challenge, and I appreciate the challenge. I was the sports information director at the time. And yet, I think that there is good reason to allow this flexibility.

**Mr. Jordan:** Anyone else wish to speak to the motion for reconsideration? This will be a roll call vote.

Microphone No. 4.

**Gene Hermitte (Johnson C. Smith University):** Gene Hermitte, Johnson C. Smith University.

I'm used to democratic procedures. I've been on the failing side of a number of votes. We've had a thorough exposition of the arguments on both sides of this. I see no reason why this needs to be reconsidered at this point. Let's live with how we voted previously.

**Mr. Jordan:** Any further comments on the motion? If not, as I said, this is a motion to reconsider. It is now time to decide the motion to reconsider.

Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no."

Are they not ready? Give us one second while we get the voting machines corrected.

Again, I want to remind the delegates, we are voting on whether to reconsider. If it's adopted, then we discuss the motion again. There will be a second vote on the proposition, itself. So this is whether to open up the opportunity to do that.

So we're now ready to decide the motion to reconsider. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

The proposal to reconsider is adopted. Proposal No. 14 is now before us.

Does anyone wish to speak to Proposal No. 14?

Microphone No. 2.

**Mr. Johnson:** Mr. Chair, Jim Johnson, commissioner of the Mid America Intercollegiate Athletics Association.

I want to clear up one thing relative to the intent of the sponsors that may be a little bit of a misunderstanding. It was never our intent to change the date, the first permissible date for exhibition contest or scrimmages. I believe that maybe some that voted on the prevailing side believed that based on some documentation in front of them.

The intent of the sponsors is only to change the first permissible date for a countable contest. This has nothing to do with the first permissible date for exhibition or scrimmages.

**Mr. Jordan:** No. 3.

**Mr. Wagon:** Stan Wagon, commissioner of the Lone Star Conference. I wanted to point out a couple of things.

First of all, it was mentioned that the sponsors of this, and those of us who are closely aligned with it, have done some research. We've looked at how this would impact us over the next 15 years. You were told that it would actually start 4.4 days earlier. But I want to make sure everybody understands what those 4.4 days are. Those 4.4 days always include Sunday, Saturday and Friday because you're always going back from the 15th to the start of the weekend.

So of those 4.4 days, three of them are on the weekend, which, in my opinion, helps us from a Life in the Balance perspective, it helps us from the other things you've heard about. There's a lot more credit here to the advantages, than there are to the opposition. I encourage you to look at that.

The next point I want to make is that three years in a row we have brought this forward. Each time we've dug further, we've dug further. We've found more and more reasons why this is a good thing. And each time there's opposition on this floor that is unfounded.

Earlier you heard a comment that there might be conflicts with volleyball. Well, if you think about it, if it's the last weekend of the volleyball season, there are 22 conferences in this room, and if we're all playing our conference tournaments, and we all have eight volleyball teams in those tournaments, then the remainder of our volleyball teams aren't playing. But the eight that are, are all at one site. So there's a maximum of 22 conflicts for volleyball, if, indeed, that's the weekend that conference tournaments are being played.

So I think the further you look into this, the more you realize that we're talking about 4.4 days, and three of those are Sunday, Saturday and Friday.

This year's a perfect example. We started on Sunday, the 15th. If this legislation were in place, we would have started on Friday, the 13th, two days earlier. We would have had an opportunity to play Friday and Saturday. For conferences like ours,

it would have opened up an additional weekend for conference contest, and provided a lot of relief, meaningful relief, at a time that we ought to protect, and that's final exam periods. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 4.

**Greg Aloia (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference):** Thank you. This is Greg Aloia from the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I want to speak in favor of this.

I'm not sure I like the idea of Friday the 13th, but that's another story (*laughter*).

One of the things that I think this really provides is not only the permissibility to allow each of the conferences to make the best decision for their athletes, but consistent with our idea of community engagement, I would love to have multiple events on our campus. Our book store manager would, too. I would love to have that energy on campus, where we can bring the community in and get them to see the intercollegiate action of our athletes in multiple sports at the same time. I think this is something that would be beneficial for our campuses, so I'm speaking in favor of it. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Mr. Salant:** Nate Salant, commissioner of the Gulf South Conference.

I again say to you, consider these other options, these other situations.

No. 1, historically, every time we have approved something and said, "This is permissive legislation," when it comes to coaches and it comes to competitiveness, it's a keeping up with the Joneses. As soon as some number of folks start doing it, every coach is going to want to do this. That's just been the history of everything that we've ever approved. We can all say, "Well, your institution can choose not to do it." It doesn't seem to work that way.

The second thing is, the leagues that are challenged in terms of the number of league games they can play because of geographics and because of an ease of regionalization, this legislation is opening the door to more conference games, and as has been described, it is not a good thing. We need more in region nonconference games.

The third thing is I heard the number 13 bandied about before, as the number of reasonable weeks to complete the season in. Well, when I did my math, 13 times two was 26. That seems to be the exact new number that we will have for basketball games.

Furthermore, I see lots of schools that play Saturday, Sunday or Friday, Saturday, and then choose to play a midweek game. You see it all the time. So I'm not sure that the arguments that are being presented hold up under scrutiny.

The last thing is, you're saying you're adding a weekend. I also heard people say before how they wanted weekend time off. Well, it seems to me that, again, we're getting it from both directions, from opposite sides. If you want a weekend off, why are you adding another weekend to a basketball season?

You're also splitting your fans. If you have a volleyball tournament, if your football game is on the road and now you're going to play home basketball, you're dividing where your fans can be at one of the most important times of the year, when you're playing your volleyball championship, when you potentially have a cross country championship every three out of four years that your teams might be involved in, you're going to have basketball, you might have football on the road in a playoff game, or next year you'll have two weekends of football games, one of which is more than likely going to be away.

It's not right. This is something that you really need to look beyond. You need to look and see what your staffing needs are. We need to look at staff reductions that are happening in many of our member institutions. I urge you to think this through very, very carefully and leave it the way it is. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** Microphone No. 1.

**Mr. Cole:** Dr. Jordan, Rick Cole, Dowling College. I would like to call the question.

**Mr. Jordan:** Is there a second? There is a second to that. That's an appropriate motion. It requires a two-thirds vote, which we will do by paddle.

All those in favor of closing the discussion, raise your paddles; all those opposed to closing the discussion, raise your paddles; all those who abstain, please raise your paddles.

The chair declares that that motion passes.

We're now to the motion on Proposal No. 14. So please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the number 1 to vote "yes," press the number 2 to vote "no" or the number 3 to abstain. Please vote now.

The polls will close in five seconds.

The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered.

The reconsideration of Proposal No. 14 is adopted.

Are there any other proposals for reconsideration?

Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Matejkovic:** President Jordan, while I don't Ed Matejkovic, athletics director, West Chester University.

I do not have a proposal for reconsideration. But as a president of the Division II Athletics Directors Association, I would like to recognize the staff and all the athletics directors and presidents who spend their time on committees. I would like to particularly express our appreciation of our organization, for your leadership and the opening of the doors of communica-

tion between the Athletics Directors Association and the Presidents Council. I think I needed to recognize that. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Jordan:** The window for reconsideration of Microphone 5. I'm sorry.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Thank you, President. While I have nothing for reconsideration, I just wanted to make a note on the floor, and ask that the NCAA ...

**Mr. Jordan:** Can we hold comments until we get the reconsideration closed?

**Mr. Sullivan:** Sure.

**Mr. Jordan:** Thank you.

Does anyone have a motion for reconsideration?

The window of reconsideration for 2010 proposals is now closed.

What I'd ask is, if you have remarks, we will get to them in a second. We have a few things we need to do first if you don't mind.

First of all, what I would like to, again, let all of you know, at the conclusion of this business session, my period as chair of the Division II Presidents Council comes to an end. I want to acknowledge Dr. Drew Bogner, the incoming chair of the Presidents Council, from Molloy College.

I also want to acknowledge a number of other very important individuals who have put a lot of time and hard work into making our division successful.

First and foremost, Tim Selgo, Dave Riggins and Butch Raymond for their outstanding leadership of the Division II Management Council this past year.

I would like to recognize outgoing Management Council members for their service: Stephanie Harrison Dyer, senior woman administrator at Albany State University (Georgia); Ann Jirkovsky, faculty athletics representative from Bellarmine University; Darrell Axtell, faculty athletics representative from St. Martin's University; Sherman Ward, faculty athletics representative, Virginia State University.

I also want to recognize outgoing Presidents Council member Joe Grunenwald, Clarion University of Pennsylvania.

I want to remind the delegates that there are box lunches out there for you as soon as we are finished.

I want to ask all of you to leave your voting units and smart cards on the table in front of you before you leave the ballroom. They will be picked up by staff.

Now we have an opportunity for closing comments from folks.

Microphone No. 5.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Thank you, Chair. Brendan Sullivan, director of athletics at Stonehill.

I would just ask that the NCAA consider the reconsideration of the reconsideration window based on that 2010 14 vote. I'm not asking to reconsider the vote, but the process of the reconsideration window.

By my quick math, nothing changed on the prevailing side from the initial, with the 136 votes. However, we lost I'm sorry, what ended being the prevailing side to approve it. However we lost 10 votes on the original prevailing side. And by my estimation, that is probably because of people that left the room.

And in a democratic process, granted, that's the responsibility of the people that left. But in a democratic process, we have to think about that and consider some way to avoid that in the future. Thank you.

**Mr. Jordan:** No. 6.

**Charles Ambrose (Pfeiffer University):** Thank you, Chairman Jordan. Chuck Ambrose, president of Pfeiffer University, a member of Conference Carolinas.

To all members of the governance structure, the National SAAC and particularly the Presidents Council, let us express presidential appreciation, Dr. Jordan, for your leadership. Without question, this Convention, its dialogue, its thoughtfulness and your leadership allows us to go back to campus with athletics in a leading and not reacting situation in regards to doing the best for our students. And that includes all students. It's not the 70 percent versus 60 percent graduation rate we should be concerned about. It's the 30 percent that don't graduate. Your commitment to students and to diversity and your leadership over the last two years have allowed this to be a game changing Convention for Division II, and we appreciate that.

**Mr. Jordan:** Thank you.

Microphone No. 1.

**Ms. Pitts:** Thank you. On behalf of the Presidents Council and all the membership, I also want to thank you, Steve, for two great years of service to Division II.

**Mr. Jordan:** Thank you.

Any other comments? If not, the Division II business session of the 2010 NCAA Convention is now considered closed.

*(Whereupon, the NCAA Division II business session was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.)*

## Division III Business Session

### Saturday, January 16, 2010

*(The Division III business session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Marriott Marquis Hotel, in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 16, 2010, was called to order at 8 a.m., with chair Paul Trible, president of Christopher Newport University, presiding.)*

**Mr. Trible:** Good morning. Welcome to all of you once again. I am Paul Trible, president of Christopher Newport University and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. It has been my great honor to serve as the chair of the Presidents Council this year. This is my last official task. So, welcome.

Joining me on the dais today are Lynn Oberbillig, director of athletics at Smith College, who also chairs the Division III Management Council; Georgana Taggart, faculty athletics representative, College of Mount St. Joseph, who serves as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher, vice president for Division III; Leah Kareti, director of Division III; Amy Huchthausen, director of academic and membership affairs; and Jeff Myers, the associate director.

We have two additional guests who will participate with special presentations this morning: Chris Martin, who is commissioner of the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin and serves as chair of the Division III Commissioners Association; and Charlotte Westerhaus, vice president for diversity and inclusion at the NCAA.

And, finally, a court reporter is joining us to help create an accurate record of our meeting. So, please remember to give your name and your school or conference if you speak at a microphone later today.

I would ask everyone at this time to silence your cell phones, please.

So, without further ado, let me ask Chris Martin, chair of the Division III Commissioners Association, to come forward. Chris. *(Applause)*

**Chris Martin (College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin):** Thank you, President Trible. Good morning. As president of the Division III Commissioners Association, it is an honor on behalf of our Association to stand before you this morning and announce our Association's Meritorious Service Award winner. Our award is given annually to the individual who over time has made significant and substantial contributions to Division III athletics consistent with the purposes of the Division III Commissioners Association.

This year's honoree began his education by graduating from not one but two Division III schools, with undergraduate and graduate degrees from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and the University of Rochester.

While his career was largely based in Division I, he was an active supporter of the Division III philosophy and Division III values. He was a champion in many ways of our Division III, our philosophy, our identity and our contributions to the NCAA through his words and actions.

It is my honor to present this award to Peg Brand, who is accepting on behalf of her husband, the late Dr. Myles Brand, the 2009 Division III Commissioners Association's Meritorious Service Award winner.

Peg, if I could ask you to come up, please.

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

**Peg Brand:** Good morning. You get up earlier than philosophers do, but good for you. Thank you so very much. If Myles were here today, he would be humbled and grateful and very proud of his background.

He cared deeply about all three divisions. He would congratulate you on your new identity to follow your passions and develop your potential, and he might even invoke those ancient philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, as he often did. He might even say those philosophers didn't always get it right.

In ancient Greece, the philosophers that we look back to divided reason and the passion. Part of your soul was rational and part of your soul was less than rational, less than fully rational. Those were the passions.

We don't think they got that right because to follow your passions is to be reasonable and rational and deliberate and thoughtful.

So, I congratulate you on your new identity, and I hope that you will enable students to understand what that means to follow your passions.

As you know, our students are young. They don't have the wisdom of many years, although many of them are so mature and so balanced in their duties and sports and pastimes that it really is amazing sometimes to see these students. But we need to help them develop their passions and to direct them, and I think you are the perfect representatives of this organization to do that. I wish you all the best.

If Myles were here, he would say congratulations to you and very humbly thank you. Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Trible:** Myles Brand was a very special person: philosopher, teacher, leader and friend of so many of us. The quality of his life and his many contributions to this Association, to Division III, to intercollegiate athletics, will be long remembered.

Peg, we thank you for being with us today, for your thoughtful and eloquent words.

Our next presentation will recognize member schools that have achieved success, significant success, in their efforts to achieve diversity in their athletics programs.

Joining us to present the award this morning is the NCAA vice president for diversity and inclusion, Charlotte Westerhaus. Charlotte, please. *(Applause)*

**Charlotte Westerhaus (NCAA staff):** Thank you, President Tribble. Good morning. This is actually my very first time, although I have been to many of your institutions in regards to aiding you in diversity and inclusion, but this is my first time to actually be at a Division III business session.

Not only is it early and impressive, but there are a lot of you. Oh, my gosh. That really impresses me just how diverse and vast the institutions are in the NCAA.

This morning I am extremely pleased to have the honor of recognizing the winners of the 2009 NCAA Division III Diversity in Athletics Awards.

The awards mark a celebration of the many possible outcomes that diversity represents. Though it is right to acknowledge the existence of diversity-related issues or concerns or challenges in intercollegiate athletics today, there are many athletic departments within your midst that are proving their leadership excellence in the area of diversity.

These departments are open to all persons, irrespective of their demographic characteristic, values, attitudes or preferences. These persons have access to all positions within the department, including leadership positions. The departments have nondiscrimination policies and regulations.

They value their student-athletes and employees and make efforts to treat them fairly and justly. In short, these departments value diversity and embody the Association's commitment to an inclusive culture for student-athletes, coaches and athletic administrators.

Though diversity stories are present, such narratives are often left untold, and you know only the bad news gets the public's attention. However, in partnerships with Dr. George Cunningham and his staff at Texas A&M Laboratory for Diversity in Sport, the NCAA is extremely pleased to recognize the athletic departments that excel in the area of diversity as recipients of diversity in athletics awards.

Now, to determine the award winners, data was gathered from archival data resources within the NCAA, and questionnaires were sent to each of your schools' top athletic administrators.

I want to add more importantly they were returned back to Texas A&M. Results were then tabulated to determine the scores in five categories: diversity strategy, general diversity of the department, racial diversity of department employees, value and attitudinal diversity of department employees, and general equity through Title IX proportionality.

The overall excellence in the diversity award represents the institutions with the highest total scores from the five aforementioned categories.

I ask this morning that each representative from the nine award-winning institutions stand at your table to be announced. I want to add this is the first inaugural award.

This is going to set the pace, I know, for many of your institutions to follow.

So, please join me as I acknowledge these recipients of the 2009 Overall Excellence in Diversity Awards.

The first institution is Carleton College and President Robert Oden.

Representing Carleton College today is Leon Lunder, professor of physical education, athletics and recreation, and the athletics director.

Chatham University and President Esther Barazzone.

Haverford College and President Stephen Emerson.

And representing Haverford College today is Wendy Smith, director of athletics.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice and President Jeremy Travis.

Representing John Jay College of Criminal Justice today is Dan Palumbo, director of athletics.

Mary Baldwin College and President Pamela Fox.

Representing Mary Baldwin College today is Sharon Spalding, director of athletics and wellness.

New Jersey City University and President Carlos Hernandez.

Representing New Jersey City University today is Dr. John Melendez, vice president for student affairs, and Alice DeFazio, director of athletics.

Representing Occidental College today is Jaime Hoffman, director of athletics.

University of Massachusetts, Boston, and Chancellor J. Keith Motley.

Representing the University of Massachusetts, Boston, is Chancellor Motley and Terry Condon, senior associate director of athletics.

The University of Wisconsin, Stout, and Chancellor Charles Sorensen.

Representing the University of Wisconsin, Stout, is Joe Harlan, athletics director. *(Applause)*

I also want to bring your attention now and focus on the screen behind me to find the award winners in the individual

categories.

The individual categories are individuals who will receive awards dealing with gender diversity, racial diversity, value and attitudinal diversity, diversity strategy, and gender equity (Title IX proportionality). Congratulations to each of our category award winners. *(Applause)*

Now, we know by research diversity makes a difference. I would like to see more research in Divisions II and III. We know in Division I there is a national award, and anyone that participates in the national award who has gotten a diversity award scores 22 more points on the average in that contest than those who don't.

We know that diversity enhances excellence on the field, and it enhances championships, and it enhances retention. It enhances creativity.

More importantly, diversity inclusion enhances the excellence of the mission of the NCAA in supporting student-athletes. So, again, congratulations to each of the award-winning institutions for your exemplary work in the area of diversity. I urge you to continue providing your leadership to the Association.

Any of you who have met me know that I am passionate about this mission of diversity and inclusion because I am passionate about Division III. Have a wonderful business meeting. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Tribble:** Charlotte, we thank you and our congratulations to all the award winners today.

Next, I would like to recognize two Division III institutions that were finalists for the NCAA Sportsmanship Award.

The NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct administers these awards. Criteria include the demonstration of the values of respect and integrity and sportsmanship while participating in intercollegiate athletics.

A student-athlete from one member school and an entire team from another were selected as finalists for the Sportsmanship Award this year. These finalists were

Carthage College, swimming student-athlete Isaac Rothenbaum; and Fitchburg State College, the women's lacrosse team.

Would institutional representatives from Carthage College and Fitchburg State College please stand so we can recognize and give them a round of applause? *(Applause)*

Also, I would like to recognize and thank the individuals who represent our division on the NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct: Marie Godwin, student-athlete, Macalester College, and Fredina Ingold, athletics director, Penn State University, Altoona.

Would those individuals stand to be recognized? Thank you for your hard work. *(Applause)*

Our first order of business is the movement toward the acceptance of the Convention Notice and Program. Please remember that you will need both your voting paddle and your electronic voting unit for any votes during today's business session.

Our procedures dictate that all voting is done by paddle or electronic device, rather than by voice or hand. Moreover, the Presidents Council and the Management Council have required the use of electronic devices on all legislative proposals.

In order to do that, it will be best to conduct a test vote now to give us plenty of time to address any technical problems if they arise.

Let me remind you of a few key points regarding the electronic voting system. The units are very easy to use. You do not need to turn the units on or off. They are always ready to transmit, and there is no antenna.

The chair reviewed issues related to the operation of the voting units.

When I declare it is time to vote, simply press the button for your selection. Press "1" for yes, "2" for no and "3" to abstain.

The number you choose will appear in the LED window on the front of the keypad. It will only appear for a moment or two, and will go out when your vote has been received by the system.

If any item other than the number you pressed appears in the LED window, please notify one of the voting technicians immediately, and they are at a table located to the side of the dais on your right.

The keypad will accept votes until the chair declares the polls closed. So, if you press the wrong vote, simply enter the correct vote before the polling stops, and the new vote will be registered.

We will wait about 30 seconds during each vote before we close the polls so there will be ample time for all of us to vote.

After the polling stops, the summary results of each electronic vote will be displayed on the large projection screens. We will then proceed to the next proposal.

Roll call votes, a school-by-school and conference-by-conference printout of the voting results, will be posted on bulletin boards located outside our meeting room. We will do that as soon as possible after our roll call votes conclude and during our morning break. We will do all we can to ensure adequate break time prior to opening of the window of reconsideration for those proposals.

Finally, please remember to leave the keypads and the inserts at your seats in the ballroom when our business session

ends. If you happen to take the keypad or insert with you, please return them promptly. Return them to the registration area or contact the NCAA staff here at the hotel, and they will make arrangements to pick them up.

Are there any questions about the electronic voting process?

To be sure the units are performing correctly, let's conduct a test vote. Anyone having any problems casting their vote should come forward for assistance. Let's vote on the following proposition: The headquarters of which Division III Athletic Conference are located closest to Atlanta?

A. Great South Athletic Conference.

B. Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference.

C. USA South Athletic Conference.

Please vote. All right. The vote has been concluded. The results are before you. The correct answer is (B). The offices of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference are located in Suwanee, Georgia, about 35 miles away. The offices for the Great South Atlantic Conference are located in LaGrange, Georgia, about 75 miles southwest of Atlanta. And the offices of the USA South Athletic Conference are in Fayetteville, North Carolina, almost 400 miles away.

Our next order of business is to adopt the Convention Notice and Convention Program. The Convention Notice is the green and white colored booklet you received in November. The Convention Program is the red, white and blue booklet that you received at registration. Please note that this year it was not necessary to include in the program any editorial corrections to the proposals contained in the notice.

We will use the paddles to adopt the Notice and Program, unless we get a vote that seems too close to call.

When we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order that they appear in those publications, unless they are reordered or have been withdrawn.

If you intend to move to reorder a proposal, the time to do so will occur in a few moments, and I will highlight that process.

Please note that any reordering of proposals designated for roll call must occur via a roll call vote.

Also, please note that by adopting the Notice and Program, you are adopting all of the appendixes found in the Convention Notice, the so-called blue pages.

This includes three legislative appendixes of notes. First are the interpretations in Appendix B, starting on Page 31, which are to be incorporated into the Division III Manual.

Second is the grouping of noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C, which starts on Page 35.

The third is Appendix D, which includes the modifications based on intent. They start on Page 59.

The amendments in these appendixes have all been approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council, and published in the Legislative Services database, also called LSDBi.

We will not discuss any of them individually unless you ask to do so. If there is such a request, we will place those amendments "off to the side" and vote to accept the rest of the package first by majority paddle vote. We will then go back and discuss the individual proposals that were broken out for separate consideration, one by one, and vote on whether they should be incorporated.

Incorporation is debatable and requires a majority paddle vote. Any proposals removed from the package for separate discussion that are not subsequently approved for incorporation are automatically referred back to the Management Council for further consideration.

Does everyone have that? I know this is a complicated process. So, are there any procedural questions that you might have? We have experts ready to answer those questions if you do. Are there any questions? If not, then let's proceed.

I will now ask for a series of motions from the floor to begin this process. First, I will ask for a motion to adopt the printed Notice and Program for the Division III business session, so that we may proceed with our work.

Second, I will ask for any motions to reorder, and we will deal with them.

Third, I will call for motions to remove items from the appendixes for separate consideration. After we deal with those motions, we then will vote to accept the Notice and Program.

First, is there a motion to adopt the Convention Notice and Program?

**James Harris (Widener University):** I am James Harris, Widener University. I move adoption of the Convention Notice and Program.

**Mr. Tribble:** It has been moved. Is there a second?

**Garnett Purnell (Wittenberg University):** I am Garnett Purnell from Wittenberg University. I second the motion.

**Mr. Tribble:** Thank you. Now, let's consider reordering. Are there any motions to reorder? There are no motions to reorder. Thank you.

If there are no motions to reorder, then we can proceed, can we not? Is there a motion to remove any of the appendixes, Appendixes B, C or D? There are no such motions, then we can proceed to a final adoption of the Notice and Program.

All those in favor of approving the Notice and Program, please raise your paddle. All those opposed? The "ayes" have

it. It is approved. Well done.

Permit me now to take a moment to review the remainder of today's agenda and timetable. We will, first, consider our one roll call proposal, No. 1, and any related amendments. Then we will consider the eight proposals in our general grouping, Nos. 2 through 9.

We believe the total voting process will take about an hour, but we will take as much time as is necessary.

When all voting concludes, we will take a brief break to allow the posting of the voting results. Following our break, we will appoint our new Management Council members. Next, we will open the official window of reconsideration regarding the morning votes. We will handle reconsideration of the roll call and non-roll call votes separately, as necessary.

After we finish reconsideration, we will have an opportunity to discuss two issues important to our division in the coming year.

First, my colleague, our colleague Jim Harris, will review the status of the discussions involving presidential leadership, including legislative concepts for possible consideration at next year's Convention.

Finally, we will also have an opportunity to further discuss the new Division III identity initiative.

There will be an opportunity to share feedback on the topic from the conference meetings yesterday, if you desire to do so.

Before we proceed, let me acknowledge the important work of several groups during the past year.

First, I want to thank the members of the Convention Planning Subcommittee. The committee met several times during the past year to help craft our meeting agenda.

Please keep our Convention format, content and timing in mind when you receive and complete the post-Convention evaluation form. The committee relies on your advice to help make this Convention a positive experience.

The subcommittee is chaired by Fredina Ingold, director of athletics and senior woman administrator, Pennsylvania State University, Altoona.

The other subcommittee members are Al Bean, director of athletics, University of Southern Maine; Greg Campbell, president of Carthage College; Kim Fierke, director of athletics at Salem College;

John Gregor, faculty athletics representative, Washington and Jefferson College; Matt Hill, vice president for athletics and student life, Northwestern College (Minnesota); Susan Hoffman, associate director of athletics, College at Brockport, State University of New York; Wendell Jack, director of athletics, California Institute of Technology; Steve Larson, commissioner, Northern Athletics Conference; Lee McKinney, director of athletics, Fontbonne University; Lynn Oberbillig, director of athletics at Smith College; Kathleen Owens, president of Gwynedd-Mercy College; Charlyn Robert, director of athletics, Nichols College; Myra Sims, senior women's administrator, Emory University; Joan Sitterly, director of athletics, State University of New York at Cortland; Erin Wojtkun, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, Christopher Newport University.

Would the subcommittee members please stand for a thunderous round of applause and thanks? (*Applause*)

Second, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Presidents Council and the Management Council for their hard work this past year. It has been a privilege to work with these individuals, and the positive and congenial relationship of these two governing bodies has served us well.

In particular, I would like to acknowledge the Council members who join me in completing their terms of service at this convention: Greg Campbell, president of Carthage College; Pam Gann, president of Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges in California.

The outgoing members of the Management Council, they include Kris Hall, director of athletics, Bard College; Rudy Keeling, commissioner, Eastern College Athletic Conference;

Jack Ohle, president of Gustavus Adolphus College; and Garnett Purnell, director of athletics, Wittenberg College.

These individuals have spent literally hundreds and hundreds of hours of their personal and professional time fulfilling their very important responsibilities, and they have represented us well. Will you, please, join me, and we would ask them to stand, in a round of applause thanking them for their leadership. (*Applause*)

There are two other groups in particular that assisted the Councils during the past year which should be recognized. One is the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory Group. This group helps to ensure that presidents from every conference have an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way in the governance, direction and leadership of Division III.

This past year the advisory group played a critical role in the development of our identity initiative. Moreover, at this Convention well over 100 presidents and chancellors gathered in large part to the good work of the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory Group.

In particular, I would like to thank the departing members of the advisory group: Patrick Ferry, Concordia University (Wisconsin); Dennis Hefner, State University College at Fredonia; Hubert Keen, State University of New York at Farmingdale; Tom Kepple Jr., Juniata College; Brian Levin-Stankeovich, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; Jackie Liebergott, Emerson College; Fred Ohles, Nebraska Wesleyan University; Rosalind Reichard, Emory and Henry College in Virginia; Larry

Schall, Oglethorpe University; Baird Tipson, Washington College (Maryland); Len Tyler, Maine Maritime Academy; Mark Wrighton, Washington University in St. Louis.

Will the members of the advisory committee please stand to be recognized? We thank you. *(Applause)*

Another group to recognize are the members of the virtual focus groups. We asked the focus group members for feedback on several important issues this year. Their advice has been invaluable to both the Management Council and the Presidents Councils. Would the members of the virtual focus groups please stand to receive our thanks? *(Applause)*

Now, would everyone else who has not been recognized please stand. *(Laughter)*

You know, the NCAA is truly a membership association. There are over 130 standing committees and numerous special committees. Over 30 of those committees are within Division III. It is only through the hard work of the people that we have recognized today that the business of this Association is accomplished. So, that is why we wanted to take time to say thank you.

We are very grateful to all of you for your presence. We are especially grateful for those people who we have mentioned today for their very special contributions over the past year, and in so many cases for so many years.

Indeed, there is one final group that I have been asked to introduce. We would like to acknowledge those who hosted an NCAA championship competition during the past year. Championships do not take place without a whole lot of work, a whole lot of effort, a whole lot of planning.

This hard work results in the quality championships that enrich the lives of our student-athletes. If you are on the staff of a school or conference office that hosted any round of an NCAA championship during the past year, we would like you to stand now so we can say thank you. Please stand. *(Applause)* Well done.

With that as the preamble, we are now prepared to move forward to our roll call votes on various legislative proposals.

Following the tradition of Division III, we will be led through that process by the chair of the Management Council, Lynn Oberbillig. *(Applause)*

*(Whereupon, Lynn Oberbillig, director of athletics at Smith College, assumed the chair.)*

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, Paul, and good morning, Division III. How are you? We are now ready to consider our proposed legislation.

Today we will consider a total of nine legislative proposals and related amendments. These proposals are numbered 1 through 9 in your Convention Notice and Program.

Proposal No. 1 is the only proposal in the Presidents Council grouping. We will begin with that proposal, conduct a roll call electronic vote for that proposal and any motions related to it.

Also, note that several questions and answers of interest appear in the Q-and-A document that was attached to the recent Division III Newsletter and included in your registration packet.

These questions and answers affect just about every proposal, and we hope you have read those.

We will attempt to call your attention to any of the information found in the questions and answers, and any Council actions and interpretations. We consider each of these effective proposals this morning.

So, let me begin with a couple of points of order.

For the benefit of the court reporter, please state your name and the institution when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones.

If I don't see you back there at Microphone 10, 11 and 12, jump up and down and shout, because this is about the longest, narrowest Convention floor we have ever had.

Also, please remember that delegates are limited to addressing each proposal twice, not counting answering questions directly posed to them by other delegates.

Finally, I would like to review a couple of parliamentary issues. Both involve a motion to cease debate, commonly referred to as a motion to "call the question."

Robert's Rules do not permit an individual delegate to cease debate simply by walking to the microphone, or shouting and reciting the phrase "I call the question." Rather, a motion to cease debate or a motion to "move the previous question" must be formally made and seconded.

That is a nondebatable motion that requires a separate vote and a two-thirds majority for adoption. If that motion is adopted, then we move immediately to the vote on the underlying proposal.

If the motion to cease debate is not adopted, debate will continue on the underlying proposal.

One more point. The chair considers it unfair for an individual cease debate or call the question immediately after he or she has made several comments regarding the merits of the proposal. In other words, if you want to cease debate, you should not engage in debate on the merits of the proposal as part of your motion. If you do so, again it will be ruled out of order.

So, thank you. We are now ready to consider our Presidents Council legislative group.

Proposal No. 1, this proposal was discussed in the Q-and-A document.

Microphone No. 2.

**Mr. Harris:** I am Jim Harris, president of Widener University, and as a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 1.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Do I have a second?

**Greg Campbell (Carthage College):** I am Greg Campbell, Carthage College. I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** It has been seconded. Thank you.

**Mr. Harris:** This proposal specifies that in the Division III philosophy statement the expectation for presidential leadership and authority over intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference and national conference levels be explicitly stated that presidents and chancellors possess the ultimate leadership responsibility within the NCAA governance structure across the Association and within each division.

However, the current Division III philosophy statement is silent regarding the leadership expectations related to presidents and chancellors at the institutional, conference and national levels.

Specifically, addressing this point within the Division III philosophy statement will recognize and reinforce the ultimate authority of leadership responsibility that the presidents and chancellors hold throughout that division.

It is important to note that this proposal is not intended to undermine institutional and conference autonomy in the exercise of its leadership role, rather it serves to underscore the critical importance of presidential leadership at every level.

As the late Myles Brand wrote in 2000 in expressing his thoughts on leadership and control in college athletics, the NCAA's single most important partnership must be with the presidents. The importance of their leadership on a national level is obvious, that they play an equally important role in change at each campus where actual reform must occur. These comments perfectly capture the intent of this proposal.

It is for that reason that the Presidents Council urges everyone to support Proposal No. 1. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Harris. Is there any other discussion regarding this proposal? Seeing none, we are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 1. Please cast your vote, "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain.

The polls are now closed. Well, what a great start. The vote is 466 for yes and no no votes. Proposal No. 1 is adopted.

Well, that concludes our initial consideration of the presidential grouping. Thank you.

We will move to the general grouping. We will proceed with the eight proposals in that group. We will still continue to use the electronic devices, but we will not post roll call results.

Our next proposal is No. 2. This proposal was also discussed in the question-and-answer document. Is there anyone who would like to move Proposal No. 2?

Microphone No. 9. Thank you.

**Angela Baumann (Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference):** Good morning. I am Angela Baumann. I am MASCAC commissioner, and I would like to move Proposal No. 2.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Do I have a second?

**Livingston Alexander (University of Pittsburgh, Bradford):** I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** There is a second. Thank you.

**Ms. Baumann:** Proposal 2 seeks to make the transfer rule consistent for student-athletes on both academic and disciplinary probation by allowing a disciplinary suspended student to also apply the two-year nonparticipation exception. Currently, only student-athletes on an academic probation are allowed to apply this exception.

This legislation was proposed after a student-athlete with a disciplinary suspension had to sit out three years, two while they are not participating, and the third in academic residency as they were unable to apply the two-year nonparticipation exception. This amounts to double jeopardy for the student on disciplinary probation and makes it extremely difficult for them to ever resume athletics participation.

By passing this legislation, future student-athletes will be able to integrate their athletic experience with their academics, which is consistent with the Division III participation philosophy.

On behalf of the MASCAC and the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, I ask you to please join the Presidents Council, SAAC and the Management Council in supporting this legislation.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you. Is there any other discussion on this proposal?

Microphone No. 11.

**Jim Nelson (Suffolk University):** I am Jim Nelson, Suffolk University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Madam Chair, I would ask your indulgence for a moment. I do have comment on the legislation. I ask that indulgence reluctantly after President Tribble had Dan Dutcher sit down at our issues forum yesterday. I have the feeling that I am in another time zone here at the back of the hall, and many would agree that sometimes I am with my voting pattern. I see that you agree with that.

I want to congratulate those 140-plus presidents who have taken the time to come to our Convention. I would also

like to bring them up to date on our president at Suffolk University, David Sargent. We have fallen on hard times.

As some of you may recall from our Convention last year, President Sargent was the highest paid president in the country at \$2.8 million per year. Well, we have slipped to second place, so we are at \$1.5 million. We don't like being Avis, and hope that he will recover.

Also, it was asked whether or not I would sing again this year, and as this was the 75th birthday of the King, Elvis, I put in the tape the other day and did listen to "The Impossible Dream." But I also recognize from last evening, which was a wonderful evening with Senator George Mitchell receiving the Teddy Roosevelt Award, that he is indeed an Elvis fan.

We came to know that he has a 12-year-old son, and I suspect that "Love Me Tender" is his favorite song.

Relative to this proposal, I certainly agree with it. I do have some reservations relative to where the information might come so that the institution that a young man or a young woman is coming into would know what that disciplinary suspension was, whether there is some legal issues that would prevent an institution from now placing that on the form that we ask for.

I would ask for an opinion from the head group, whether or not we still can ask for what the disciplinary suspension was.

If a student has an assault against them, I think we should know that.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** I think that would be up to the individual institutional choice. Our legislation does not prohibit asking that question.

**Mr. Nelson:** It does not. OK. Are there any other legality issues to that?

**Ms. Oberbillig:** That would be an institutional decision, as well, and I would advise people to consult their own institutional counsel.

**Mr. Nelson:** Thank you, ma'am.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you. Is there any other discussion on Proposal No. 2? Seeing none, we are now ready to vote. Please cast your vote: "1" for yes, "2" for no and "3" to abstain.

The polls are closed. Proposal No. 2 is adopted with 418 yes votes, 43 no votes, and 4 abstain.

Our next proposal is No. 3. This proposal was discussed in your Q-and-A.

Microphone No. 9.

**Ron Thomas (University of Pugot Sound):** Good morning. I am Ron Thomas, president of the University of Pugot Sound. As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 3.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Is there a second?

**Mr. Harris:** I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** It has been seconded. Thank you.

**Mr. Thomas:** This proposal amends the unnecessarily complex tryout legislation currently in effect to focus on the issues relevant for our division. The current tryout regulations are a product of the days when the legislation applied to all three divisions, but now is cumbersome and can be at odds with the way that division programs operate and our ability to fulfill our institutional missions.

This proposal reorganizes and deregulates this legislation more in keeping with Division III.

First, it keeps intact certain areas of the current legislation, such as the prohibitions against traditional tryouts and combined-type events. At the same time, it provides greater latitude regarding the activities our institutions can conduct on campus and the outside coaching activities in which our coaches may participate.

This proposal will clarify and simplify the tryout limits within the context of the needs of Division III. Therefore, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Mr. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Thomas. Is there any other discussion on this proposal?

Microphone No. 6.

**John Ratliff (Keene State):** I am John Ratliff, Keene State. Madam Chair, just a question about the procedural order on the AAU component of this bylaw. I want to know if this would be the time to request dividing the proposal and what would be the process?

**Ms. Oberbillig:** The process would be to make a motion to divide and ask that the AAU proposal be considered separately.

**Mr. Ratliff:** I would so move.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Do I have a second to the motion to divide?

From the Floor: I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you. The floor is open now for discussion on the motion to divide. The motion is to divide out the AAU portion and to take a separate vote on that part of the proposal.

Microphone No. 6.

**Mr. Ratliff:** We all know the pressures that are self-placed on our basketball coaches to attend AAU summer ball

tournaments. Remember the AAU provision will result in even more pressure on our coaches to support AAU events. I encourage the group to support dividing the AAU provision. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Is there any further discussion on the motion to divide?

Microphone No. 8.

**Kristen Hall (Bard College):** I am Kristen Hall, athletic director at Bard College. As a member of the Management Council, I would like to speak in opposition to dividing this proposal. The Management Council's goal does not believe that AAU basketball should be treated differently than other sports.

The nonscholastic and club sport model for this sport have evolved a great deal over the years in many sports, volleyball, lacrosse and softball, for example. The structure of club level has become much more organized in the development and advancement of high school and college.

In many cases, these sports are organized as AAU basketball has been for several years. Therefore, while it may have been appropriate to single out AAU years ago, it is just not the case anymore given the club sports structure that now exists in many other sports.

While we hear in the news about the ills of youth basketball, those problems exist primarily at the elite level, where most young people may enroll in Divisions I or II schools. Many of the issues are rooted in the ultra-competitive recruiting culture that exists in Division I basketball.

In large part, these are not the types of players that we see in Division III because their motivations are different than Division III student-athletes. Furthermore, there simply is not a strong enough justification to treat AAU basketball differently than other nonscholastic type basketball.

In fact, teams that are part of the AAU structure actually have more oversight than some teams that choose not to affiliate with the AAU but are still just as much a part of the youth basketball environment.

Let's allow our institutions to monitor and make decisions about the outside club teams that all of our coaches in every sport may be involved in. While the basketball community may fear the potential recruiting advantage and increased pressure to coach AAU basketball by opening this up, let's all remember that in every sport our coaches can coach club teams. In fact, it has not resulted in feedback that there is undue pressure on coaches in other sports.

Therefore if we continue to accept this practice in other sports, why should the same opportunities not exist in basketball? Greater involvement by Division III coaches with the AAU basketball could actually help improve the culture in that sport. It seems a better alternative than the current environment that isolates AAU basketball from all other sports of nonscholastic opportunities in that sport and all other sports.

It is for those reasons that I urge you to oppose dividing this proposal and encourage you to support the entire proposal.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you. Is there any other discussion on the motion to divide? OK. Seeing none, a motion to divide is a simple majority vote. So, a "yes" vote will divide the motion, and then we will consider AAU basketball separate from the original motion. A "no" vote will keep AAU basketball in the original motion, and you have the Option No. 3 to abstain.

The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The motion to divide fails: 105 yes, 354 no and 9 abstains, which brings us back to the original Proposal No. 3.

Is there any further discussion on Proposal No. 3? Seeing no one at the microphones, we are ready to vote. Press "1" for yes, "2" for no and "3" to abstain. The polls are closed. The motion carries, 385 yes, 76 no and 3 abstain.

Our next proposal is No. 4. Again, this proposal was discussed in the Q-and-A document.

Microphone No. 7.

**Kathy Owens (Gwynedd-Mercy College):** I am Kathy Owens, president of Gwynedd-Mercy College. As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 4.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Do I have a second?

**James Bultman (Hope College):** I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** It has been seconded. Thank you. Continue.

**Ms. Owens:** This proposal establishes criteria for a coaching staff member to permissibly observe prospects participating in recreational activities or enrolled student-athletes participating in nonorganized sports-specific activities.

Under current legislation, coaches are not allowed to observe a prospect or an enrolled student-athlete engaged in nonorganized sports-specific activity regardless of safety and security needs or normal employment duties.

The current rules create a very real and pragmatic issue for many of our programs. This monitoring dilemma is not new.

For the last year, we have operated under a blanket waiver that permits our coaches to monitor facilities for safety and security purposes if this responsibility is part of the coach's normal employment duties and the coaching staff member is monitoring the facility while open to all students.

This waiver was approved by divisional leadership because it accounts for a student-athlete and general student body well-being first and foremost.

We must also consider the current economic climate and how it has affected our institutional resources.

If this proposal passes, many of our institutions will be able to keep the facilities open to our student body. Conversely, if the proposal is not adopted, there will be institutions that will be forced to cut the facility hours and access because they will be unable to hire additional personnel to fulfill their duty to provide a safe and secure environment for our student body and our student-athletes.

This proposal offers institutional autonomy to make decisions that reflect our resources, needs and desire to provide opportunities for our student body and student-athletes.

There are likely to be some that express concern about the increased pressure on student-athletes to participate in these open activity sessions. This proposal contains measures against coaches conducting practice activities that should guard against abuses.

Furthermore, doing so would be a violation, plain and simple. This fear of coaches intentionally violating the legislation should not serve as a primary motivation for failing to adopt this proposal in light of the very real issues that exist. The potential coach acting without integrity does not outweigh the potential consequence of reduced or eliminated opportunity for student-athletes.

The Division III philosophy emphasizes campus integration, including that student-athletes are not treated differently than the general student body. This proposal aims to ensure that student-athletes can continue to participate in activities that are open to all students.

Without it, opportunities for student-athletes and all students are jeopardized. For this reason, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Owens. Any further discussion on this proposal? We need to put the music back on to liven you guys back up again.

Anyway, seeing no one at the microphones, we are ready to vote on this proposal. Again, press "1" for yes, "2" for no, "3" to abstain.

The polls are now closed. The motion is approved: 340 yes, 120 no, 6 abstain.

Our next proposal is No. 5. You can find details in the question-and-answer document, as well.

Microphone No. 9.

**Mr. Bultman:** I am Jim Bultman, president of Hope College, a member of the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 5.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Is there a second?

**Catharine Hill (Vassar College):** I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** It has been seconded. Thank you. Continue.

**Mr. Bultman:** Our playing seasons are governed by the guiding principle that practice and competition should be regulated to minimize interference with the academic programs of our student-athletes. While this principle applies throughout the academic year, it is especially necessary and appropriate during this nontraditional segment. This proposal directly supports that guiding principle by assuring a minimum amount of time passes between the end of the nontraditional segment and the start of final exams.

Simply put, we should not be conducting our nontraditional season in a manner that can compromise our student-athletes' academic pursuits. Unfortunately, current legislation permits that conflict to occur at the end of the nontraditional season.

This proposal addresses that ill by requiring the nontraditional season to conclude five days before the exam period, thereby providing our student-athletes the opportunity to properly prepare for their examinations. This proposal also provides greater flexibility for our schools on the quarter system to conduct fall nontraditional seasons.

Currently, their ability to conduct a full nontraditional season in the fall is hindered by the October 30 end date. Flexibility provided in this proposal allows student-athletes at quarter institutions the same athletic opportunities as their peers at semester institutions.

This proposal establishes a proper relationship between the student-athletes' academic pursuits and the institution's flexibility to conduct its nontraditional seasons.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Bultman.

Microphone No. 3.

**Andrew Darkow [Westminster College (Missouri)]:** I am Andrew Darkow, a tennis student at Westminster College (Missouri).

As a member of the NCAA Division III Student- Athlete Advisory Committee, I speak in support of Proposal No. 5. We believe that a buffer of five weekdays between the institution's final exams and nontraditional segment guarantees and protects a minimum amount of time for student- athletes to focus solely on their academic pursuits.

The time period immediately before final exams is crucial to a student-athlete's academic success and should not be encroached by a nontraditional segment, a segment dedicated to instruction and team building.

A five-weekday buffer ensures that a student-athlete is afforded this minimum academic preparation time regardless of the student-athlete support and the institution's academic calendar or teams' playing and practice season declarations.

If our division values the student-athlete's academic experience as much as the athletic one, we need to take measures to secure the presence of academics.

Often a student-athlete's work, class and sports schedule will conflict. Final exams and reading periods are time when there should be no uncertainty. Academics in this instance are paramount.

Proposal No. 5 reinforces this concept, securing the appropriate time needed for final exam preparation. Academic-related proposals that preserve the integrity of a student-athlete's education and enhances the academic success are legislations worth supporting.

This proposal embodies the division's commitment to our academic success and well-being. It is time to take our new Division III platform and turn it into a reality now by supporting Proposal No. 5. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, Andrew.

Microphone No. 9.

**Leon Lunder (Carleton College):** Members of this body, I move to divide the sports of golf, tennis and rowing from this proposal.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** I have a motion to divide. Is there a second? It has been seconded. Thank you. Continue, please.

**Mr. Lunder:** I speak on the part of equity relative to these sports. By equity, I mean what is fair and what is appropriate opportunity for our student-athletes.

Although we do not sponsor rowing in our league, we do sponsor the sports of tennis, and I do want to speak specifically to the sport of golf as our traditional season is held in the fall.

They call us the Midwest, but we are really in the north central part of the country. We have seven months of winter and five months of bad sledding.

I am also aware that there are also five conferences at least that sponsor golf in the traditional season in the fall. A number of those conferences have early graduation around the beginning of May. With this proposal, it would preclude these athletes from meeting sponsorship requirements to be eligible for postseason competition.

Also in our part of the country, it is important for us to be able to run a split season in which some of our competition is held in the fall and some in the spring, because we don't have long enough of either to be able to have the full complement of opportunity for our student-athletes.

Because the selection process requires that in women's golf, in particular the three contests or three competitions must be held in the nontraditional season or in the spring for them to be eligible for postseason competition, we would like to retain that possibility.

But if you have an early May graduation, finals prior to that, you back up five days from that, even though they would be allowed to practice, you would be hard-pressed to get the competitions in without taking extended travel to a warmer part of the country, which is extremely expensive.

We ask you to consider the removal of these sports from this piece of legislation as I am sure those who have tennis in the fall as a traditional season and also the sport of rowing would be affected by climate situations. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, Leon. Is there further discussion on the motion to divide?

Microphone No. 9.

**Eva Dean Folkert (Hope College):** My name is Eva DeanFolkert, Hope College. I am a member of the Division III Women's Golf Committee, and I would just like to support Leon's rationale for dividing this bylaw. Women's golf is actually a contracting sport in Division III. We are losing schools who are sponsoring the sport. Part of the reason is opportunity.

If we limit the number of weeks that teams can compete in the spring, I am afraid that golf will continue to decline. Currently, seven of the 12 AQ conferences play their traditional seasons in the fall.

For them, as Leon pointed out, to satisfy requirement of three rounds in the spring by the disparate weeks of examination of many of our schools in the spring, say, the third week in April up until the second week in May, there would be limited opportunity for those contest requirements to be played.

So, for those reasons, as well, I ask that you support the dividing of this bylaw amendment. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Microphone No. 11.

**Kitty Baldrige (Gallaudet University):** I am Kitty Baldrige, faculty athletics representative from Gallaudet Univer-

sity. As a member of the Management Council, I would like to speak in opposition to the motion to divide for separate consideration. This proposal is about setting the right priorities.

As a priority, we should not permit our nontraditional seasons to compromise the student-athletes' preparations for finals. This is true regardless of the sport the student-athlete plays or the season in which he or she plays it.

The academic priorities set forth in this proposal must take precedence over any other issues. Scheduling concerns, and certainly competitive equity concerns should not outweigh the academic needs for our student-athletes.

I am confident that as a division we can find solutions to the problems raised here today, while upholding the primacy of our student-athletes academic pursuits. That solution, however, does not include separating this proposal.

A vote in support of this proposal, the entire proposal, affirms that the academic well-being of our student-athletes is a paramount concern for our division.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote against a motion to divide. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you.

Microphone No. 3.

**Isaac Stein (Washington University in St. Louis):** I am Isaac Stein, tennis student-athlete, Washington University in St. Louis.

While the SAAC recognizes that some sports seasons are unique, we believe that there should be consistency among all sports when it comes to guaranteeing adequate preparation time for finals, and this is why the SAAC opposes dividing this proposal.

This proposal in its original format ensures that if the team elects a nontraditional segment in either the fall or spring, that nontraditional segment will never encroach on a student's preparation for finals.

Division III did not adopt legislation in this area last year. It was referred based on concerns voiced largely from the SAAC, academic concerns.

Last year's proposal didn't go far enough. It provided consistency, but it didn't account for those last days before finals, our academic priority.

This year's proposal is academic in nature. It provides for a final exam preparation time period, as well as a consistent end date. Under the current legislation, practice and competition in the nontraditional segment can and is being scheduled on the day before final exams. This is detrimental to student-athletes' preparation for ultimately success on final exams.

As a tennis student-athlete, I feel strongly that I should be afforded at least five weekdays before finals to concentrate solely on academics. Dividing this proposal will take from me the guaranteed opportunity to prepare for examinations while affording it to others. For these reasons, I urge you to oppose the division of this proposal. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you.

Microphone No. 9.

**Larry Papenfuss (Concordia College, Moorhead):** I am Larry Papenfuss, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota. I want to speak in favor of the amendment to divide these sports out. I would just like to raise a point that if this legislation had passed last year that would have required these sports to not compete in those five days prior, it would have precluded our teams from competing in a national tournament.

Last year at this time, as many of you know, we were involved in the epic flood plight that would not have made it possible, and that is unfortunately more typical in our part of the climate and geography than it is atypical.

So, I would urge you to reconsider and to support the amendment to withdraw these three sports. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you.

**Jeff Myers (NCAA staff):** Just to clarify the point. On the NCAA championship competition piece, if you conduct your nontraditional in the spring and are reasonably under consideration for NCAA championships, you can continue to practice but not compete in order to prepare for the NCAA championships.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Microphone No. 7.

**Else Lebsack (Mills College):** I am Else Lebsack, Mills College. I would like to support the divide of these three sports specifically for women's rowing. The West Coast Championships fall within the five days prior for many schools, which would remove the possibility of the six Division III institutions on the West Coast to have final championships prior to championships selection. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you.

Microphone No. 8.

**Ira Zeff (Nebraska Wesleyan University):** I have a question of clarification for Jeff. I have always considered golf, tennis, and I guess rowing might be in the same situation, as more of a split sport even though there is a nontraditional clarification in the manual.

But if not a split sport and we're truly considering it a nontraditional sport, I think we all have been cheating because

I think we all play more than one date of competition during that nontraditional segment. So, I would like to have a clarification if we are only allowed 16 practices and we are only allowed to have one date of competition during that time period.

**Mr. Myers:** For the sport of golf and tennis, the split season, the segments are still defined as traditional and nontraditional, but you do not have the competition limitations that you do in the sports of baseball, soccer, lacrosse, women's volleyball. I am sure I am missing one or two, but I think you understand what I am getting at.

So, in golf and tennis, you are still within the parameters of the legislation by engaging in more than one competition during what you are calling the nontraditional season.

**Mr. Zeff:** Under this legislation that is being proposed, can you play during that week before finals, then?

**Mr. Myers:** For the segment that you call the nontraditional segment, you would not be able to play or practice the five days before finals unless you are under consideration for NCAA championships, and then you could practice but not compete.

**Mr. Zeff:** With that in mind, considering it a split sport, Nebraska Wesleyan would hope we would divide that out. We definitely consider golf and tennis really a regular season for both fall and spring. There are a lot of advantages for doing that from splitting up the time of missed class time for matches by having a full schedule in the fall as well as in the spring. So, I would encourage everyone to divide this out.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you. Any further discussion on the motion to divide?

Microphone No. 9.

**Mr. Lunder:** I just want to clarify that we are not necessarily opposed to the concept of student-athletes in those five days prior to finals. This really has to do with opportunities, equitable opportunities for student-athletes in these sports. We don't consider this as the final exam period during winter sports cross over the final exam period of the fall semester.

We talk about nontraditional seasons, traditional and nontraditional seasons. But as was pointed out by Ira, this situation is a little bit different. This is that equity issue relative to the sports of tennis, golf and rowing.

So, I want people to consider these sports have specific differences. If we wanted everything to be the same, we would all play on Saturdays only and we would only have 10 contests a year.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you.

Microphone No. 3.

**Rudy Keeling (Eastern College Athletic Conference):** I am Rudy Keeling, commissioner of the Eastern College Athletic Conference. As a member of the Management Council, I speak in opposition to the motion to divide. Golf, tennis and rowing student-athletes have the same finals that the rest of our student-athletes have, and they need to prepare for those finals just like the rest of our student-athletes do.

So, why wouldn't we afford them the same opportunity to prepare for those finals? I don't know, and I don't know how we can justify saying on the one hand that student-athletes need relief from the nontraditional season to study, but only some student-athletes get that relief. It is not equitable, not logical, and not consistent with Division III values to place the scheduling or competitive concern above an academic concern.

If there is a problem in the way the seasons are structured for golf, tennis and rowing, then let's look at that issue and fix that problem. But that problem should not have any bearing on this proposal.

This is a proposal about academic principles, period. Therefore, I urge you to support the proposal.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you. Is there any further discussion on the motion to divide? Seeing no one at the microphone, we will now vote on the motion to divide golf, tennis and rowing from the original proposal. A "yes" vote would divide those three sports out for separate consideration. A "no" vote leaves them in the original package and proposal. Press "2" for no, "1" for yes, "3" for abstain.

The polls are open. The polls are now closed. The motion to divide fails with 258 no votes, 194 yes votes. We will return to the original proposal. Any further discussion is in order on the original proposal.

Microphone No. 4.

**Mr. Purnell:** Garnett Purnell, athletic director at Wittenberg University. As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 5. At the heart of this proposal is the academic welfare of our student-athletes. The proposal rightly stands for the position that the nontraditional segment should not impede a student-athlete's academic preparation.

By taking that position, there may be some additional burden on us as administrators, especially in colder weather climates, to account for the potential spring scheduling challenges presented by this proposal.

However, it is better and more appropriate for us to shoulder that scheduling burden than for student-athletes to be academically impacted.

While this proposal causes a greater burden on some, it also provides greater relief for others. Under this proposal quarter schools would be afforded greater flexibility to conduct full fall nontraditional seasons, thereby providing their

student-athletes similar opportunities as those attending semester schools.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you. Is there any further discussion on Proposal No. 5?

Microphone No. 2.

**Sue Petersen-Lubow (U.S. Merchant Marine Academy):** I am Sue Petersen-Lubow, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. Just a point of clarification. For those of us who have final exams in the middle of October, is there a waiver opportunity, or at least to discuss?

**Ms. Oberbillig:** I turn to my able reference point here, Jeff Myers.

**Mr. Myers:** As the proposal is written, it refers to the fall and the spring final exams. So, there is not a waiver referred to in the proposal.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Is there any discussion? Seeing no one at the microphone, we will now vote on Proposal No. 5. "1" is for yes; "2" is for no; and "3" to abstain.

The polls are now closed. The motion carries: 368 yes votes, 90 no votes and 6 abstain.

This brings us to our next proposal, which is Proposal No. 6. This proposal was discussed in the Q-and-A document.

Microphone No. 2.

**Amy Carlton (American Southwest Conference):** I am Amy Carlton, American Southwest Conference. On behalf of the membership of the American Southwest Conference, the Empire 8 and the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 6.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Do I have a second? It has been seconded. Thank you. Continue, Amy.

**Ms. Carlton:** Teaching is a cornerstone of the coaching profession. Proposal No. 6 allows football coaches a quality-focused preseason opportunity to teach and enhance the sports skills of their student-athletes. The proposal calls for the addition of an optional on-field one-hour walk-through session during each day of the five-day acclimatization period during the present practice session.

Strictly defined activities serve to focus walk-through workouts on teaching and integrating information presented during the off-field meetings with the student-athletes' sports skills. Theory becomes action.

The co-sponsors, as well as the Presidents Council, the Management Council and the SAAC urge your vote in favor of Proposal No. 6 as an enhancement in the development of the student-athletes' skills within a strict teaching environment. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Is there any further discussion on Proposal No. 6? Seeing no one at the microphones, we are now ready to vote. A "1" vote for yes, "2" for no, "3" for abstain.

The polls are now closed. Proposal No. 6 carries. 342 yes votes, 36 no votes, 84 abstain.

Our next proposal is No. 7. This proposal was discussed in the Q-and-A document.

Microphone No. 8.

**Marcia Keizs [York College (New York)]:** I am Marcia Keizs, president of York College, and a part of the CUNY Conference.

As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 7.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Do I have a second? It has been seconded. Thank you.

**Ms. Keizs:** Thank you. Proposal No. 7 promotes student-athletes' well-being because it makes the treatment of all student-athletes seeking the hardship waiver more equitable. Under the current rule, the standard calculations to determine whether a student-athlete qualifies for a hardship waiver is based on the number of scheduled or completed contests for each specific institution.

However, the number of scheduled or completed contests or dates of competition varies from school to school for a host of reasons such as budget, geography, philosophy, weather, conference scheduling, policies, all of which are beyond the control of the student-athlete.

This proposal addresses the inequities created by these variables, and what it tries to do is to set a common set of standards for all institutions so that all student-athletes in the given sports will use the same standard regardless of the institution they attend or how many contests were actually scheduled or completed.

This change promotes student-athlete well-being. It ensures that student-athletes have an appropriate number of competitive opportunities relative to various institutions and to their conference. Further, it accounts for the variability in scheduling.

In sum, the proposal enhances our Division III student-athlete experience. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 7. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Keizs.

Microphone No. 7.

**Mary Jo Gunning (Marywood University):** I am Mary Jo Gunning, director of athletics and recreation, Marywood

University. As a member of the Management Council and the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, I also rise in support of Proposal No. 7.

This proposal changes the calculation of the hardship waiver formula used to determine whether a student-athlete is eligible for such waiver and would create consistent standards for the entire membership regardless of the scheduling variances that exist, which are beyond the control of the student-athlete, yet directly impact him or her to receive a hardship waiver.

The establishment of consistent standards would significantly ease the burden on conference offices and their administration of the waiver, and address the ongoing confusion in counting of contests, dates of competition at the institution, conference and the Committee on Reinstatement level.

Sometimes the hardship legislation is considered confusing to apply, with different calculations required in order to determine whether a student-athlete is eligible for such waiver. Oftentimes for those of us who have done these waivers, it feels like you need to be a math expert in order to properly ensure that each student-athlete is given just cause, that each calculation is accurate, scheduled or completed contests, or dates of competition, the first half of the season, odd or even number of contests, rounding up, determining one-third. It is a lot to manage.

Simply put, it should not be that complicated for our membership to understand and to apply. It is for these reasons, but primarily with the positive impact it would have on student-athlete well-being, that I urge you to support Proposal No. 7. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you.

Microphone No. 2.

**Donna Ledwin (Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference):** I am Donna Ledwin, commissioner of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference.

Just a point of clarification. I understand there is a retroactive piece to this. I think it would be beneficial to the group if that could be explained.

Who does this apply to? Is it just effective next year, or how far back would this legislation apply?

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Amy, will you take that question for us?

**Amy Huchthausen (NCAA staff):** I sure will. Yes, as Donna mentioned and as I think we noted yesterday during the Issues Forum, and it is also listed in the most recent version of the Q-and-A, the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement during its December meeting agreed that this proposal should have a retroactive effective date.

It was originally sponsored and entered as an August 1 date, but based on the committee's December action, it could be applied, if adopted, to any injury that occurs prior to August 1, as well.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Microphone No. 2.

**John Reeves (Landmark Conference):** John Reeves, Landmark Conference. Does that mean that we must have contemporaneous documentation from three years ago, or whatever?

**Ms. Huchthausen:** Yes. The remainder of the hardship waiver legislation will continue to apply, including the requirements and conditions on medical documentations. So, yes, that is correct.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** We are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 7. Again, cast your vote, "1" for yes, "2" for no, "3" to abstain.

The polls are now closed. The motion carries, 441 yes, 20 no and 1 abstain.

Our next proposal is No. 8. You can find details on this discussed in the question-and-answer document.

Microphone No. 2.

**Ken Baker (Ohio Northern University):** I am Ken Baker, president of Ohio Northern University and a member of the Ohio Athletic Conference.

As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 8.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Is there a second?

**Mr. Campbell:** I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** There is a second.

**Mr. Baker:** Proposal No. 8 will simplify application of the playing seasons legislation and reinforce the principle of institutional autonomy by affording institutions the flexibility to conduct alumni contests at a time that best serves their needs.

In baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball, this proposal would permit a student-athlete to participate in one date of competition and an alumni contest during the nontraditional segment without losing a season of participation.

Under current legislation, if an institution conducts an alumni contest in addition to the one date of competition in the nontraditional segment, a student-athlete's participation in the alumni contest would cause him or her to use a season of participation.

Proposal No. 8 establishes an exception allowing the institutions to conduct both contests without adversely impact-

ing the student-athlete's eligibility if he or she participates in the alumni contest.

Such contests are conducted primarily to promote good will among an institution's former student-athletes. That same good will should not adversely affect the institution's current student-athletes.

This proposal allows student-athletes to build relationships with alumni through competition during the nontraditional segment without triggering use of a season of participation. Adopting the proposal would clarify that a student-athlete never triggers the use of a season of participation by competing within the nontraditional segment.

It is important also to note that this proposal will not lengthen the playing season. The current playing season rules would continue to apply, and institutions would still be required to count the alumni contests as one of the 16 permissible days of athletically related activity during the nontraditional segment.

Voting in support of Proposal No. 8 promotes institutional autonomy by providing clarity and flexibility in applying the legislation. I, therefore, urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Baker. Is there any further discussion on Proposal No. 8? Seeing none, we are now prepared to vote on Proposal No. 8. Again, "1" for yes, "2" for no, "3" to abstain.

The polls are now closed. The motion carries: 433 yes, 18 no, 10 abstain.

Our next proposal and final proposal is No. 9. This proposal was discussed in your Q-and-A document.

Microphone No. 2.

**Mr. Harris:** I am Jim Harris, Widener University, a proud member of the Middle Atlantic Conference.

As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 9.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Do I have a second?

**Ms. Keizs (York College):** I second it.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** It has been seconded. Thank you. Continue.

**Mr. Harris:** This proposal allows institutions to conduct exempted alumni contests prior to the first permissible contest date provided the alumni contest occurs sometime during the legislative playing season. It is important to note that this proposal differs from Proposal No. 8 that was just voted on.

Proposal No. 8 addressed whether an alumni contest triggers the use of a season of participation in the specified sports. This proposal, Proposal No. 9, addresses the timing of when an alumni contest may be scheduled, and it applies to all sports that permit alumni contests.

Current legislation allows institutions to conduct exempted alumni contests either during the nontraditional segment or during the traditional segment after the first permissible contest date. This proposal will provide institutions with increased flexibility when scheduling alumni contests by allowing them to conduct these contests at any time during the declared playing season, including the preseason.

This proposal provides several benefits to our institutions. First, it allows institutions to schedule alumni contests whenever those contests best fit their own schedules and calendars, rather than restricting them to specific time periods.

Second, this increased flexibility in scheduling will provide more opportunity for institutions and student-athletes to participate in these contests.

Alumni contests are important public relations and community events, as well as avenues by which alumni maintain connections to our institutions.

Finally, it is important to note that this proposal would not increase the length of the playing season, as all alumni contests would still have to occur within the legislative playing season.

For these reasons, the Presidents Council urges the membership to support Proposal No. 9.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Harris. Is there further discussion on Proposal No. 9? Seeing none, we will move to vote on Proposal 9: "1" for yes, "2" for no and "3" to abstain.

The motion carries: 453 yes, 4 no, 1 abstain.

Kudos to all of you. Congratulations. (*Applause*)

That concludes this morning's Presidents Council general grouping. Thank you for your attention and cooperation.

We will post the roll call results outside the meeting room as soon as possible. Just let me remind you, we will take a short break, and after the break we will elect our new Management Council members, and we will open the window to permit the reconsideration of any of the proposals.

Amy would like to make a note about reconsideration.

**Ms. Huchthausen:** I just want to clarify the motions to divide, the final results on the motion to divide are not eligible for reconsideration, only in the final result in this case. All the proposals were adopted. Those would be the points eligible for reconsideration.

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, Amy.

Now, let's take a break, and I will see you back at 10 o'clock.

*(Recess.)*

*(Whereupon, Mr. Tribble assumed the chair.)*

**Mr. Tribble:** Thank you for taking your seats. Thank you for returning to your business session this morning. Our next item of business involves the election of our new Management Council members. You will recall that under our governance structure the Nominating Committee initially solicits and selects Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review those nominations. But the positions ultimately are filled by a vote of our membership during our annual business session.

I believe we have four new appointments. You should have received the slate of nominees with your registration materials.

To present the official slate of nominees will be the chair of the Nominating Committee, Tim Millerick, vice president for student affairs and athletics at Austin College. Tim Millerick (Austin College): On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I would like to thank the Division III membership for their interest in serving on the NCAA governance structure. If anyone has any questions or information, you should feel free to speak to the Nominating Committee members or Sharon Tufano at the NCAA office.

I move the following slate of nominees to serve on the Division III Management Council: Stanton Ching, faculty athletics representative, Connecticut College; Timothy Downes, director of athletics, Emory University; Portia Lowe, senior woman administrator, Lake Forest College; Christopher Thomforde, president of Moravian College.

**Mr. Tribble:** Thank you, Tim. The committee's nominees have been moved. Is there a second?

**Ms. Baldrige:** I second it.

**Mr. Tribble:** There is a second. Are there other nominations from the floor? If not, we can proceed to a vote. We will use our paddles for this process. All those in favor of the slate presented by the Nominating Committee, please raise your paddles. Thank you. All opposed. The "ayes" have it. The slate is approved, and we thank you.

Let's ask our four new Management Council members if they might stand to be recognized. Will you, please, stand? Thank you very, very much. *(Applause)*

I also want to remind you of recent appointments to the Presidents Council. As you may remember, members of that body are appointed by a vote of the Division III presidents and chancellors. Our new members are Brian Levin-Stankevich, chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; Jack Ohle, president of Gustavus Adolphus College; Frederik Ohles, president, Nebraska Wesleyan University; Rosalind Reichard, president of Emory and Henry College.

Would those new members of the Presidents Council please stand? Let's give them a round of applause. *(Applause)*

It is now time to complete our legislative agenda. Again, leading us through this process, I will call on Lynn Oberbillig. *(Whereupon, Ms. Oberbillig assumed the chair.)*

**Ms. Oberbillig:** Thank you, President Tribble. Our remaining legislative task is the window of reconsideration related to our roll call and non-roll call votes.

The "window of reconsideration" is now open for Proposals Nos. 1 through 9 and their related amendments. As a reminder, a motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote.

Any voting delegate can second that motion.

Reconsideration then occurs by a majority vote. If the motion to reconsider is adopted, the morning vote no longer applies, and the proposal then is back before us for further discussion and another vote.

If we do have a motion to reconsider and it is seconded, we will deal with that motion and the underlying proposal before we consider any motion to reconsider another proposal.

Finally, please remember that the vote on a motion to reconsider a roll call vote also must occur by roll call. That applies this year to Proposal No. 1. Reconsideration of Proposals Nos. 2 through 9 does not require a roll call vote.

So, is there a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that we handled this morning, Nos. 1 through 9, and the related amendments from someone who voted on the prevailing side?

Seeing no one at the microphones, I want to thank you for your cooperation and your good-spirited discussion, and let us continue. *(Applause)*

*(Whereupon, Mr. Tribble assumed the chair.)*

**Mr. Tribble:** Lynn Oberbillig is a very able and effective leader. She is the chair of our Management Council, and she has another year to lead that council, and she has also led us through our legislative agenda today in a most expert and expeditious way. Will you give her a round of applause? *(Applause)*

Next, I would like to call on Jim Harris, president of Widener University and chair-elect of the Presidents Council. Jim will review the status of the discussions regarding presidential leadership.

**Mr. Harris:** Good morning, everyone. Thank you, Paul. I think my job today is on presidential leadership and how we might move forward with Proposal No. 1 in the future.

Before I do so, I think that when we talk about presidential leadership, we have had no better example of presidential

leadership for the NCAA Division III than our chair this year, President Paul Tribble from Christopher Newport University. Paul has served on the Presidents Council for the past four years, and he has been making these trips back and forth from Indianapolis to Christopher Newport. He has put in countless hours, and also it is important for all of us to recognize that we wouldn't have made the progress that we have made in this last year with regard to the identity initiative without Paul moving us and inspiring us, cajoling us to try to move forward on this issue.

He has always kept in the front of all our minds that what unites is greater than what divides us. So, respectfully, if I might have you stand up, Paul, and may we give him a round of applause for his fine leadership over the past year?

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

We have been making progress on the topic of presidential leadership throughout the past year, but without a question our primary focus during this past year has been the identity initiative, and with the formal launching of the platform this morning, or actually yesterday morning, we are placing greater attention on presidential leadership in preparation for next year's Convention.

From the onset, I think it is important to understand what the Presidents Council and what we meant in the white papers when we referred to presidential leadership. This discussion is really about allowing presidents to do what they do best, deal with strategic issues and fundamental issues of principle, while delegating to our trusted athletic colleagues those issues that are more administrative and operational.

I think you all agree that presidents tend to work best at a strategic level. I know that some of you will say we have our heads in the clouds, but I think we work best when we look at the big picture. There is a feeling on the Presidents Council, however, that during the last few years we might have dealt too often with the operational issues rather than the key strategic issues, and at times that has not served us well. We should not, as presidents, and will not abdicate our responsibilities related to issues that directly relate to the Division III philosophy and the new strategic-positioning platform that we as a division have created.

But the Council believes it should be more selective in identifying issues that truly matter to us and to our colleagues across Division III. Please keep that in mind as you consider the following comments and slides.

As you probably know, since 1997 the Association has placed presidents in its ultimate leadership positions in the governance structure. A presidential body leads the governing structure of each division, and the Executive Committee, which deals with Association-wide matters is made up exclusively of presidents.

The NCAA's decision to hire Myles Brand, a sitting university president as its CEO in 2002, served to further emphasize presidential leadership in the Association. However, there is a gap that we need to address and we did address, and I thank you for the vote that we addressed at this Convention.

As you have heard earlier, the Division III philosophy statement is silent on the issue of presidential leadership. This really reflects the fact that the statement was created in the early 1980s when presidential leadership was much more controversial and less of a given even in our division.

That said, we also know based on the 2008 spring membership survey that at most Division III schools, athletics report directly to someone other than the president or the chancellor.

This model exists at about 80 percent of our member schools, and the most typical direct report is the vice president for student affairs, or about 50 percent of those, followed by the vice president for academic affairs or provosts.

There is nothing wrong with this model and, in fact, it seems a great way to reinforce that athletics is fully integrated into the campus life and the administrative framework on all of our campuses. It also helps to reinforce the earlier point that presidents are best served when they can delegate operational and administrative issues, and that includes operational and administrative issues related to collegiate athletics.

The survey findings also suggest that we should take a harder look at the current Division III governance structure and consider if that structure would be more effective if it directly reflects the typical campus reporting structure.

Based on these concepts, the Presidents Council has developed the following recommendations:

First, for this Convention the Council has made a conscious effort to limit those proposals that it designated for its "presidential grouping." Those are the proposals that we ask presidents to pay special attention to, and for which a roll call vote is required to help ensure accountability.

Proposal No. 1 was the only proposal included in that grouping this year. We intend, moving forward, to be more selective on which proposals are included in the grouping and to limit the proposals that we ask the presidents to focus on to those which are truly strategic and fundamental in nature.

Moving toward next year's Convention and beyond, we will continue to explore ways through which presidents can exercise greater strategic leadership in the division. This discussion will focus not only on the Presidents Council, but also the Presidents Advisory Group and the entire group of presidents and chancellors across Division III.

How might we achieve this goal? One idea is to add to the Management Council two administrators to whom athletics reports, such as vice president for student or academic affairs. We already know the significant role and influence

these individuals exercise over our athletics programs.

These folks are experienced in determining which issues need and deserve presidential attention from those that do not. By adding these individuals to the Management Council, we can help identify the strategic and fundamental issues that need to move forward to the Presidents Council from the more administrative and operational issues that can be resolved by the Management Council.

We already have two presidents who serve on the Management Council to ensure a presidential perspective on that body.

Those two presidents, together with two vice presidents, and perhaps an additional president or two from the Management Council, could perform the initial review of all legislative and policy recommendations to identify what should be forwarded to the Presidents Council from those which should not.

Under this arrangement, we should also consider permitting the Management Council to propose operational and administrative legislation directly to the membership, like it did before 1997. It seems no longer necessary or desirable for the Presidents Council to sponsor every governance structure proposal forwarded to the membership for a vote.

A second idea is to identify presidential provisions in the Division III Manual and require a supermajority vote for those proposals to be changed. An obvious example for our division is our financial aid provision.

Under this scenario, the financial aid legislation could be established as a "division dominant" legislation. A proposal would be forwarded to the Division III membership for a vote. If two-thirds of the membership vote in favor, any subsequent amendments to the financial aid legislation would require a two-thirds majority vote to be effective.

The benefit of this approach is that it would help us identify and designate those legislative provisions that are fundamental to the division's philosophy and identity, and specify that those provisions could only be changed if it is the will of a supermajority of the division's members.

The ability to establish legislation as "division dominant" already exists in the Constitution, and I should note that the Divisions I and II have used this principle successfully on a limited basis, as well.

Finally, I want you to know that the Council intends to discuss in more detail the issues of presidential leadership among our conferences. Our legislation requires that presidents and chancellors have the ultimate responsibility and final authority for conference operations, and that is very appropriate.

We know, for example, in many conferences presidential oversight boards do not exist, or presidents don't meet on a regular basis.

This fact became clear to us this past fall when we attempted to schedule meetings on a conference-by-conference basis with presidential leadership to discuss the identity initiative and the strategic-positioning platform.

To be frank, it is difficult to understand how conference presidents can effectively exercise their leadership and oversight authority without meeting at least via conference call on a regular basis, but in some conferences this is not happening.

One final idea that is not on the PowerPoint. We have expressed this informally to the Convention management, our wish that the Convention schedule might be further condensed to permit discussion and voting on key issues during one business day.

That might require an evening business session for items included in the presidents legislative grouping, which we will limit. While I don't have anything firm to report in that regard, it is important to remember that the Convention schedule, of course, affects all three divisions and its presidents, but we believe it is an idea that has merit.

I will pause here and welcome your feedback regarding any of the presidential leadership issues I have covered, or anything else that might come to mind. I have been assured that Dan and other colleagues of Dan's here can help me with any technical issues. So, please, any comments or questions? Thank you very much.

Before I sit down, as the Division III representative on the NCAA presidential search committee, I want to bring you up to date on the search for the next president of the entire Association.

As you may know, a six-member search Committee, being chaired by Ed Ray, president of Oregon State and the chair of the Executive Council of the NCAA, was announced prior to the holidays. The Committee has met in person three times. The first meeting was in December when we selected a firm, the Parker Executive Search firm, to conduct a search, and the firm's principal is Dan Parker, who is one of the two principals involved in the search that helped us attract Myles Brand in 2002.

The search committee has five goals, one of which we have accomplished so far, and that was to select a search firm.

Second, to gather input for the membership on the expectation for a new president.

Third, to identify a set of qualified candidates to conduct the first round of those interviews, and then to identify finalists for the full Executive Committee to interview. It will be the full Executive Committee of the Association that will have the final vote and say.

Our expectation is to move this along during the spring and into the summer, to have someone named by early sum-

mer so they may take the position by the start of the academic year in the fall.

I would like to just take a moment, if anyone has any comments or suggestions on what we believe should be Division III priorities for selecting this individual, or what we might be looking for in the characteristics of a new president. So, we will open the floor for any comments that you might have. I take that as a vote of trust. Thank you very much.

If you have any comments about the search and you would like to reach me personally, my e-mail is jtharris@widener.edu. You can contact the NCAA with nominations on their website, or also the Parker Executive Search firm. Thank you.

**Mr. Tribble:** I want to thank Jim Harris for his leadership this year. I am very grateful for the friendship that has developed between us during this time, and I will tell you that you are in capable hands next year as he leads the Presidents Council.

Now, as we bring this business session to a close, we want to end as we began by turning our attention to the identity initiative. The thought here is simply this: Time has passed since we first broached that subject, talked about it. The round-table discussions developed, I thought, great ideas.

We know that there will be a 30-second video that will be completed during the next couple of weeks and ready for your use. We know that this is the very beginning, that there will be other videos, other speakers, other voices, but the important thing is everyone that I have talked to has said we have really nailed it when we have shared the values that inspire us and unite us as a division.

So, the thought here is simply if any of you have benefited from additional ideas or insights shared in your conference meetings, or any of you would care to stand up in front of a thousand people and share your thoughts or good advice, we would like to take that with us as we move forward and bring this initiative alive across the United States and on each of our campuses.

The mikes are available. Is there anyone that would care to add something to that discussion at this time?

Yes, Microphone 1, please.

**Charlyn Robert (Nichols College):** I am Charlyn Robert, athletics director at Nichols College. One of the thoughts that has been shared amongst some members is that we appreciate the \$1,000 that you are giving to each institution, but could we not get better value for that money if it was combined? And potentially could a position be created with over \$400,000, such as a media director, someone who could potentially use all of our championships and coordinate the effort to get the message out? Would that not be a better way to spend our money than everyone having a small portion of the pie, put the pieces of the pie together and get a better value for our dollar?

**Mr. Tribble:** That is a good suggestion, and I am sure my colleagues will take that under consideration as we move forward. Thank you. Anyone else? If not, I will take silence as consent and also recognition that we have had a good day together and a good Convention.

This session, I might observe, has been the most markedly free from debate and controversy of any that I have attended. I would attribute that to two things, first of all, the expert job that our colleagues at the NCAA staff do to prepare us, to inform us on the issues. I would like to publicly acknowledge the incredible job that they do. Will you join me in saying a word of thanks? *(Applause)*

Secondly, I really believe that this is a historic time in the life of Division III. I believe we have turned the corner. I believe that we have put behind us the debates and the controversy and the tension that one used to feel when you would come to these meetings, and we are now at a point where we can celebrate the qualities that unite us and inspire us, and the unity of purpose so well defined in our strategic-positioning platform that will guide us and instruct us in the days ahead.

So, I thank each of you for your contribution to making that possible. I think we can look forward with great confidence to the future, both in terms of the success of the NCAA, the success of our beloved Division III, and also the increased success of each of us on our campuses, and most importantly, the student-athletes that we lead and that we serve each day.

So, I thank you for your participation, I thank you for your attention, and I ask you to remember to leave your voting units and paddles in your places. Please remember box lunches are available outside of the ballroom.

So, with that, we wish you a great new year and Godspeed. We are adjourned.

*(Whereupon, the meeting was duly adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)*

	Practice Vote	Proposal No. 2008-46	Proposal No. 2008-59
<b>DIVISION I — VOTING RESULTS</b>			
Alabama A&M University	N	N	Y
Alabama State University	N	Y	N
Alcorn State University	N	Y	N
America East Conference	A	Y	Y
American University	N	A	Y
Appalachian State University	N	Y	N
Arizona State University	N	N	N
Arkansas State University	N	N	N
Atlantic 10 Conference	N	Y	Y
Atlantic Coast Conference	N	N	Y
Atlantic Sun Conference	N	N	N
Auburn University	Y	N	N
Austin Peay State University	N	N	Y
Ball State University	N	Y	Y
Baylor University	N	N	Y
Bethune-Cookman University	N	N	N
Big 12 Conference	N	N	Y
Big East Conference	N	N	N
Big Sky Conference	N	A	Y
Big South Conference	A	N	Y
Big Ten Conference	N	Y	Y
Big West Conference	N	N	Y
Binghamton University	N	Y	N
Boston College	N	N	Y
Bowling Green State University	N	Y	Y
Bradley University	N	Y	Y
Brigham Young University	N	N	Y
Butler University	N	Y	Y
California Polytechnic State University	N	N	Y
California State University, Fresno	N	N	Y
California State University, Fullerton	Y	N	N
California State University, Northridge	N	Y	Y
Campbell University	N	N	N
Canisius College	N	Y	Y
Central Connecticut State University	N	Y	
Charleston Southern University	Y	N	Y
Chicago State University	Y		N
Clemson University	N	N	Y
Cleveland State University	Y	N	Y
Colgate University	N	Y	Y
College of the Holy Cross	N	Y	N
College of William and Mary	N	N	N

Colonial Athletic Association	N	N	Y
Colorado State University	N	A	Y
Columbia University-Barnard College	N	Y	Y
Conference USA	N	N	N
Delaware State University	Y	N	Y
Drake University	N	Y	Y
Duke University	Y	N	Y
East Carolina University	N	N	Y
East Tennessee State University	N	N	N
Eastern Illinois University	Y	Y	N
Eastern Michigan University	N	Y	N
Elon University	N	Y	N
Fairfield University	N	Y	Y
Florida A&M University	N	N	Y
Florida Atlantic University	Y	N	N
Florida International University	N	N	N
Gardner-Webb University	N	N	Y
George Mason University	Y	N	Y
George Washington University	N	Y	Y
Georgetown University	N	N	N
Georgia Institute of Technology	N	N	N
Georgia Southern University	Y	N	N
Georgia State University	N	N	N
Gonzaga University	N	N	Y
Hampton University	N	N	Y
Harvard University	N	Y	Y
High Point University	N	N	Y
Hofstra University	N	N	N
Horizon League	N	Y	Y
Howard University	N	N	N
Idaho State University	N	N	N
Illinois State University	N	Y	Y
Indiana State University	A	Y	Y
Indiana University, Bloomington	N	Y	Y
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	Y	Y	Y
Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne	Y	N	Y
Iona College	A	Y	Y
Iowa State University	N	N	Y
Ivy Group	N	Y	N
Jacksonville State University	N	N	N
Jacksonville University	N	N	N
James Madison University	N	Y	Y
Kansas State University	N	N	Y
Kennesaw State University	A	N	Y

La Salle University	N	N	N
Lamar University	Y	N	N
Lehigh University	N	Y	Y
Liberty University	N	N	N
Long Beach State University	N	N	Y
Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus	A	Y	Y
Longwood University	Y	N	N
Louisiana State University	N	N	N
Loyola Marymount University	N	N	Y
Loyola University (Illinois)	N	A	Y
Manhattan College	A	Y	Y
Marist College	Y	Y	Y
Marshall University	Y	Y	N
Mercer University	Y	N	N
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y
Miami University (Ohio)	Y	Y	Y
Michigan State University	N	Y	Y
Mid-American Conference	N	Y	Y
Middle Tennessee State University	N	N	N
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	N	N	Y
Mississippi State University	Y	N	N
Mississippi Valley State University	N	Y	Y
Missouri State University	N	N	Y
Missouri Valley Conference	Y	Y	Y
Monmouth University	N	N	N
Montana State University-Bozeman	A	N	Y
Morehead State University	N	N	N
Morgan State University	N	A	N
Mount St. Mary's University	N	Y	N
Mountain West Conference	N	N	N
New Jersey Institute of Technology	Y	Y	A
Niagara University	N	Y	Y
Norfolk State University	N	N	Y
North Carolina State University	N	N	Y
Northeast Conference	N	Y	Y
Northeastern University	N	Y	Y
Northern Arizona University	N	A	Y
Northern Illinois University	N	Y	Y
Northwestern University	N	Y	Y
Oakland University	Y	N	Y
Ohio University	N	Y	N
Ohio Valley Conference	N	N	Y
Oklahoma State University	Y	Y	Y
Old Dominion University	Y	N	Y

Oregon State University	N	N	Y
Pacific-10 Conference	N	N	Y
Patriot League	N	Y	Y
Pennsylvania State University		Y	Y
Pepperdine University	N	N	Y
Princeton University	N	Y	Y
Providence College	N	Y	Y
Radford University	Y	N	Y
Rice University	N	N	N
Rider University	A	Y	Y
Robert Morris University	N	Y	Y
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick	Y	Y	N
Sacred Heart University	N	N	N
Saint Francis University (Pennsylvania)	N	A	Y
Saint Joseph's University	N	Y	N
Saint Louis University	N	N	
Sam Houston State University	N	N	N
San Diego State University	N	N	N
San Jose State University	Y	N	N
Santa Clara University	N	N	Y
Savannah State University	N	N	N
Seton Hall University	N	Y	N
Siena College	A	N	Y
South Dakota State University	N	Y	Y
Southeastern Conference	N	N	N
Southern Conference	A	N	N
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	N	N	Y
Southern Methodist University	Y	A	Y
Southern Utah University	Y	Y	Y
Southland Conference	N	N	N
Southwestern Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y
St. Bonaventure University	N	Y	Y
St. John's University (New York)	N	N	N
St. Peter's College	N	Y	Y
Stanford University	N	N	Y
Stetson University	N	N	N
Sun Belt Conference	N	N	N
Syracuse University	N	A	Y
Temple University	N	N	N
Tennessee Technological University	N	N	Y
Texas A&M University, College Station	N	N	Y
Texas Christian University	N	N	N
Texas Southern University	N	N	N
Texas State University-San Marcos	N	N	N

Texas Tech University	N	N	Y
The Citadel	N	N	Y
The Ohio State University	N	Y	Y
The Summit League	N	Y	Y
Towson University	N	Y	N
Troy University	N	N	N
Tulane University	N	N	N
U.S. Air Force Academy	N	N	Y
U.S. Military Academy	N	Y	N
U.S. Naval Academy	N	N	N
University of Missouri, Kansas City	N	A	Y
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	N	N	N
University of North Carolina, Asheville	N	N	N
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	Y	N	N
University of North Carolina, Wilmington	N	Y	Y
University of North Florida	N	N	N
University of Portland	N	N	Y
University of South Alabama	N	N	N
University of Texas at Arlington	N	N	Y
University of Texas at San Antonio	N	N	N
University at Albany	N	N	Y
University at Buffalo, the State University of New York	N	Y	Y
University of Akron	N	Y	Y
University of Alabama at Birmingham	Y	N	N
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa	A	N	N
University of Arizona	N	N	Y
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	N	N	N
University of Arkansas, Little Rock	N	N	N
University of California, Berkeley	N	Y	N
University of California, Davis	N	N	N
University of California, Los Angeles	N	N	N
University of California, Riverside	N	N	Y
University of California, Santa Barbara	Y	N	N
University of Central Florida	N	N	N
University of Cincinnati	N	N	N
University of Colorado, Boulder	Y	A	Y
University of Dayton	Y	N	Y
University of Delaware	Y	Y	N
University of Denver	N	N	N
University of Detroit Mercy	Y	A	Y
University of Evansville	N	Y	Y
University of Florida	N	N	N
University of Georgia	N	N	N
University of Hartford	N	Y	Y

University of Hawaii, Manoa	N	N	Y
University of Houston	N	N	N
University of Idaho	N	A	Y
University of Illinois at Chicago	Y	Y	Y
University of Illinois, Champaign	Y	Y	Y
University of Iowa	N	Y	Y
University of Kansas	N	Y	Y
University of Kentucky	N	Y	N
University of Louisiana at Monroe	N	N	N
University of Louisville	N	N	N
University of Maine, Orono	Y	Y	Y
University of Maryland, College Park	N	N	Y
University of Maryland, Eastern Shore	N	Y	N
University of Memphis	N	N	N
University of Miami (Florida)	Y	N	N
University of Michigan	N	Y	Y
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	Y	Y	Y
University of Mississippi	Y	N	Y
University of Missouri, Columbia	N	N	Y
University of Montana	N	N	N
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	N	Y	Y
University of Nevada, Reno	N	N	Y
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	N	N	N
University of New Hampshire	Y	A	Y
University of New Mexico	N	Y	N
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	A	N	N
University of North Texas	N	N	N
University of Northern Iowa	N	Y	Y
University of Notre Dame	Y	N	N
University of Oklahoma	A	N	Y
University of Pennsylvania	N	Y	Y
University of Pittsburgh	A	Y	N
University of Rhode Island	N	Y	Y
University of San Diego	N	N	Y
University of South Carolina, Columbia	N	N	N
University of Southern California	N	N	N
University of Southern Mississippi	N	N	N
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	Y	N	N
University of Texas at Austin	N	N	Y
University of Texas at El Paso	N	A	N
University of the Pacific	N	N	N
University of Toledo	Y	Y	Y
University of Tulsa	N	A	N
University of Utah	Y	N	N

University of Virginia	N	N	Y
University of Washington	Y	N	Y
University of Wisconsin, Green Bay	Y	A	Y
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	N	Y	Y
University of Wyoming	N	N	Y
Utah State University	N	A	Y
Utah Valley University	A	N	Y
Vanderbilt University	N	N	N
Villanova University	N	N	N
Virginia Commonwealth University	N	N	N
Virginia Military Institute	Y	N	
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University	N	N	Y
Wake Forest University	A	N	Y
Weber State University		A	Y
West Coast Conference	A	N	Y
West Virginia University	N	N	N
Western Athletic Conference	N	N	N
Western Carolina University	Y	N	Y
Western Kentucky University	A	N	Y
Wichita State University	N	Y	Y
Winthrop University	N	N	Y
Wright State University	N	Y	Y
Xavier University	N	Y	Y
Yale University	N	Y	Y
Youngstown State University	N	Y	Y
YES	53	100	166
NO	214	168	118
ABSTAIN	19	19	1
TOTAL	286	287	285

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	Package of proposals preliminarily supported by LGC	2009-14-A	2009-14-B	2009-16-B FBS only	2009-16-B FCS only	2009-29	Amendment to 2009-30-B	2009-30-B
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	S	S	S			D	S	R
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	S	S	S			S	S	R
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	S	S	D	S		S	S	R
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	S	D	S			S	D	S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS	S	R	S	D		D	S	R
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	S	D	S	S		S	D	D
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	S	S	D		S	S	S	R
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	S	S	S		S	S	S	S
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S	S	D	S		S	D	D
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	S	R	S			S	S	S
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	S	R	S		S	S	D	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	S	D	S	S		R	S	R
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	S	S	S			S	D	S
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	S	S	S		D	R	S	R
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	S	S	R			D	S	R
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	S		S	S	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	S	S	S		S	S	S	S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	S	S	S		S	R	D	S
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	D		D	S	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	S	R	S		D	S	S	R
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	S	S	R		S	S	S	S
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	S		D	A	D
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S	R	S		S	S	S	R
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS				S		R	A	R
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	S	S	R		S	S	S	S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	S	R	S		S	S	S	R
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	S	S	S		S	S	S	S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	S	S	D	S		R	S	R
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	S	S	S			S	S	S
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	S	S	R			R	D	S
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	D		S	S	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS					S			
Support (S)			48.0	31.8	34.5	21.0	11.0	30.0	33.0	18.9
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			0.0	9.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	23.1
Defeat (D)			0.0	7.2	8.7	6.0	2.0	9.9	12.0	9.0
Abstain (A)			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
No Vote Cast (Blank)			3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total			51.0	51.0	51.0	27.0	13.0	51.0	51.0	51.0

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	2009-30-A	2009-43	2009-51-B	Amendment to 2009-48 FBS only		2009-48 FBS only	Amendment to 2009-54-B FBS only	2009-54-A FBS only	2009-56
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	S	S	S						S
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	S	S	S						S
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	D	S	S	S		S	D	A	S
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	S	S	S						S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS	S	S	R	D		S	S	A	S
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	D	S	S	D		S	S	S	S
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	S		R	D	S	S
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	R	S	S						S
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	D		S	S	S	S
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	S	S	S						S
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	S	S	D						S
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	R	S	S						S
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	S		S	D	S	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	S	D	S						S
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	D	S	D	D		S	S	S	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	D	S	S						S
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	D	D	S	S		S	A	S	D
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	D		S	S	A	S
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	S	S	S						S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	D		S	S	S	S
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	S	S	S						S
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	S	S	S						S
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	R	S	S	D		S	D	S	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS									
Support (S)			35.4	46.8	45.3	10.5		24.0	15.0	18.0	48.0
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			3.9	0.0	3.0	0.0		3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Defeat (D)			11.7	4.2	2.7	16.5		0.0	9.0	0.0	3.0
Abstain (A)			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	3.0	9.0	0.0
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total			51.0	51.0	51.0	27.0		27.0	27.0	27.0	51.0

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	Amendment to 2009-64	2009-64	2009-69	2009-72	2009-77	2009-82	2009-86	Package of proposals preliminarily opposed by LGC	2009-2
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	D	S	S	D	D
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	R	S	S	D	R
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	D	S	S	S	R	S	S	D	D
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	D	S	D	S	D	S	D	D	S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS	D	S	S	S	R	S	D	D	S
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	D	S	S	S	S	S	S	D	D
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	R	S	S	D	D
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	R	A	S	D	D
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	R	S	S	S	D	D
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	R	S	S	D	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	A	S	D	S
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	D
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	D	S	S	D	D
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	R	S	R	D	D
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	A	S	D	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	R	A	S	D	D
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	D	S	D	S	D	S	S	D	D
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	D	S	S	D	D
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	R	A	S	D	D
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	S	D	S	S	D	S
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	R	S	S	D	D
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS	D	S	R	S	S	S	S	D	
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	S	A	S	D	D
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	R	D	S	R	R
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	S	A	S	D	S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	D	S	S	S	R	A	S	D	D
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	D	S	S	S	S	A	S	D	R
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	D	S	S	S	R	S	S	D	D
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	A	S	S	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS									
Support (S)			18.0	51.0	45.6	48.0	22.5	35.1	45.6	4.2	17.1
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	19.5	0.0	1.2	2.4	4.8
Defeat (D)			33.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	9.0	1.2	4.2	44.4	26.1
Abstain (A)			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Total			51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	2009-65 not moved	2009-35 FBS only	2009-74	2009-84	2009-10 FBS only	2009-12-B	2009-12-A	2009-15	2009-19-A	2009-19-B	Amendment to 2009-22	2009-22 as amended	2009-27
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I			S	D		S	D	D	R	R	S	D	D
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I			S	D		D	S	S	R	R	S	S	S
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS		S	D	D	S	D	S	S	R	R	S	S	S
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I			S	D		S	S	D	R	R	D	D	S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS		D	D	R	D	S	D	S	R	R	S	S	S
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS		S	S	D	D	S	D	S	R	R	S	S	S
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS			D	R		R	R	D	R	R	S	S	D
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS			S	R		S	S	S	R	R	S	S	S
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS		R	D	D	R	D	S	S	D	R	S	R	S
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I			R	D		R	R	R	R	R	S	S	R
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS			S	D		S	D	S	D	S	S	D	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS		D	R	R	D	R	R	S	R	R	S	R	S
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I			S	D		S	D	D	D	R	S	S	S
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS			D	D		S	S	D	R	R	S	R	S
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I			S	D		D	S	S	R	R	S	S	S
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS		S	S	D	S	D		D	D	R	D	S	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS			S	S		D	S	D	R	R	S	S	S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS			D	D		D	D	S	D	D	S	R	D
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	S	S	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS			S	D		D	S	S	R	R	S	S	S
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS			R	D		S	R	S	R	R	S	R	S
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS		S	S	D	S	D	D	S	R	D	S	S	S
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS			D	D		D	D	D	R	R	S	S	D
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS		R	D	S	S	D	R	S	R	D	S	R	
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS			D	D		D	D	D	R	R	S	R	D
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS			S	D		R	R	S	R	R	S	S	S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS			S	S		S	S	D	R	R	S	S	S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS		S	S	D	S	D	D	S	R	R	S	S	D
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I			S	D		D	S	S	R		S	S	S
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I			D	D		D	D	S	R	R	D	S	D
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS		S	D	D	S	S	S	S	R	R	S	S	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS													
Support (S)				15.0	24.9	6.9	15.0	18.6	19.8	37.5	0.0	1.2	47.1	33.6	38.1
Distribute for Membership Review (R)				6.0	5.4	8.4	3.0	6.6	10.8	1.2	42.9	41.4	0.0	13.8	1.2
Defeat (D)				6.0	20.7	35.7	9.0	25.8	18.9	12.3	8.1	7.2	3.9	3.6	8.7
Abstain (A)				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Vote Cast (Blank)				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.0
Total				27.0	51.0	51.0	27.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	2009-26	2009-27 FCS only	2009-28-B section B - FBS	2009-28-B remainder of proposal	Refer 2009-28-B to Recruiting Cabinet FCS only	2009-35 FCS only	2009-28-A	2009-32-A	2009-33
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I				D			D	S	S
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I				D			D	S	S
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS			D	D			D	D	D
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I				D			D	D	D
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS			D	D			D	R	R
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS			D	D			D	S	S
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	S			D	S	D	S	D	S
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	S			D	S	S	D	D	D
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS			D	D			D	D	S
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I				R			D	D	D
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	S			D	S	S	D	D	D
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS			D	D				S	S
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I				D			D	S	D
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	S			R	S	D	S	D	D
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I				S			D	S	S
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS			D	D			D	D	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	S			R	S	S	S	D	D
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	S			R	S	R	D	D	D
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS			D	D			S	S	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	S			D	S	D	D	D	R
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	S			D	S	R	D	D	R
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS			D				D	S	S
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S			D	S	D	D	D	D
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS			D	D			S	D	R
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS				D	S	D	D	D	D
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	S			D	S	D	D	S	S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	S			R	S	R	S	D	D
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS			D	D			D	S	S
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I				D			D	D	D
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I				D			D	D	D
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS			R	S			R	R	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS	S				S	D			
Support (S)			13.0		0.0	2.7	13.0	3.0	9.3	18.0	24.0
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			0.0		1.5	6.0	0.0	3.0	1.5	4.5	8.4
Defeat (D)			0.0		25.5	39.3	0.0	7.0	37.2	28.5	18.6
Abstain (A)			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0.0		0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0
Total			13.0		27.0	51.0	13.0	13.0	51.0	51.0	51.0

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	2009-32-B	2009-38 FCS only	2009-39	2009-40	2009-41	2009-42	2009-44	2009-45 FCS only	2009-47-B	2009-47-A FBS only	2009-47-A FCS only	2009-49 FCS only
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I		R	S	S	R		S		S			
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I		R	S	R	D		S		D			
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS		R	S	R	S		S		R	D		
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I		S	S	S	S		S					
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS		R	D	D	R		D		D	D		
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS		R	D	D	D		S		S	S		
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	S	R	S	D	S		S	D	S		R	S
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	S	R	R	D	D		S	D	S		D	S
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS		R	S	S	S		R		S	S		
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I		R	S	D	S		R		R			
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S		S	D	S		D	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS		R	R	D	S		S		D	D		
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I		R	S	S	S		R		S			
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	S	R	S	D	S		D	D	S		R	D
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I		R	S	A	S		R		S			
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS		R	S	S	S		S		D	D		
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	D	R	D	S	S		S	D	S		R	S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	R	D	D	D	S		S	D	R		R	R
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS		S	S	D	S		S		D	D		
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	S	R	S	D	D		S	D	S		D	D
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	S	R	S	S	R		R	D	S		R	S
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS		S	D	S	D		S		S	S		
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S	R	D	S	S		S	D	S		R	D
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS		R	R	D	R		R		D	D		
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	R	R	R	D	S		S	D	S		R	S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	S	R	S	S	S		S	D	R		R	S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	S	D	D	S	R		S	D	S		R	S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS		R	S	S	S		S		S	S		
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I		R	S	S	D		S		D			
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I		R	D	S	S		S		S			
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	S	R	S	S	S		R		S	S		
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS	S							D			R	D
Support (S)			9.0	6.9	27.6	23.7	30.6		34.5	13.0	28.8	12.0	0.0	8.0
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			2.0	41.7	8.4	4.2	9.6		12.3	0.0	6.6	0.0	10.0	1.0
Defeat (D)			2.0	2.4	15.0	21.9	10.8		4.2	0.0	14.4	15.0	3.0	4.0
Abstain (A)			0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total			13.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0		51.0	13.0	51.0	27.0	13.0	13.0

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	2009-50	2009-52 FCS only	2009-57 FCS only	2009-58	2009-61	2009-62	2009-63	2009-66	2009-70	2009-79-D not moved	2009-75-B
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	D			D	S	S	D	S		R	D
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	S			S	S	S	S	S		R	D
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	R			S	D	S	S	S		R	
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	D			D	S	S	S	D		R	S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS	S			A	S	S	S	S		R	
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	D			D	S	S	S	S		R	D
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	A	R	S	S	D		R	S
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	D	D	D	S	D		R	D
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S			S	D	R	S	S		R	S
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	D			S	D	D	R	S		R	S
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		R	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	R			D	S	D	S	S		R	A
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	R			R	D	R	S	R		R	R
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	R	S	S	S	R		R	R
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	D			S	S	D	S	S		R	S
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	D			S	D	D	D	S		R	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	A	D	D	S	S		R	S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	D	R	S	D	S	R	D	D		D	S
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	S			S	S	S	S	S		S	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		R	S
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	D	R	R	S	S		R	R
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	S			D	S	S	S	S			D
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	D	D	D	D	S		R	S
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS	S			R	S	R	S	S		R	S
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	R	R	D	S		R	S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	A	A	S	S	D		R	R
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	A	D	D	S	S		R	S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	D			D	S	S	S	S		R	S
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	D			D	S	S	S	D		R	S
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	D			D	D	D	S	S		R	S
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	S			A	S	S	S	S		R	R
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS		S	S								
Support (S)			17.4	12.0	13.0	15.0	30.3	27.30	43.50	41.40		1.50	26.10
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			13.2	1.0	0.0	6.6	3.6	10.80	1.20	2.40		45.30	6.30
Defeat (D)			20.4	0.0	0.0	20.1	15.9	12.90	6.30	7.20		1.20	9.60
Abstain (A)			0.0	0.0	0.0	9.3	1.2	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	3.00
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00		3.00	6.00
Total			51.0	13.0	13.0	51.0	51.0	51.00	51.00	51.00		51.00	51.00

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	2009-15-A	2009-19-B	2009-19-A	2009-19-C	2009-80 FBS only	2009-81 FBS only	2009-81 FCS only	2009-83	2009-88	Amendment to 2009-94
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	D	S	D	S				R	S	S
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	D	S	S	S				R	S	S
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	D	R	D	D	A	S		R	R	S
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	R	S	S	R				R	D	S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS		R	R	R	A	S		R	R	S
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	D	D	D	D	A	S		R	S	S
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	D	D	D	R			S	R	D	S
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	D	S	D	R			S	R	S	S
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	D	A	S		R	D	S
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	D	S	D	R				R	R	S
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	S			S	S	S	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	R		R	R	S	S		R	S	S
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	D	S	D	R				R	S	S
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	D			S	R	S	S
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	D	S	S	S				R	S	S
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	S	D	S	D	S	S		R	S	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	R			S	R	S	S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R			S	D	R	S
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	S	D	D	D	S	S		R	S	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	D	D	D	D				D	S	S
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	D			S	R	S	S
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	D	D		D	A	S		S	D	S
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	D	R	D	R			S	R	D	S
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS	R	S	S	R	D	S		R	S	S
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	S	D	S	R			S	R	S	S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	R			S	R	R	S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	R			S	R	S	S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	D	S	S	D	A	S		R	D	S
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	R	S	S	S				R	S	S
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	R	D	D	D				R	S	S
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	R	S	D	R	S	S		R	S	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS							S			
Support (S)			8.40	27.00	23.40	6.00	7.50	27.00	13.00	4.20	30.30	51.00
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			14.70	7.20	6.00	23.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.40	9.60	0.00
Defeat (D)			24.90	13.80	18.60	21.30	3.00	0.00	0.00	2.40	11.10	0.00
Abstain (A)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No Vote Cast (Blank)			3.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total			51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	27.00	27.00	13.00	51.00	51.00	51.00

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	2009-94 as amended	Amendment to 2009-96	2009-96	2009-97	2009-98 section A	2009-98 section B	2009-98 section C (preseason practice)	2009-98 section C (maximum contests)	2009-78
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	R	S	R	S	R	R	D	D	D
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	S	D	S	S	R	R	R	R	R
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	S	R	S	R	R	S
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	R	R	D	R	D
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS	R	D	S	S	D	D	R	R	R
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	D	D
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	S	S	R	R	R
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	D	D	D	D	D	D
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S	D	S	S	S	S	R	D	R
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	S	S	R	R	R	S	R	R	R
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	S	S	R	D	D	D	D	S	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	S	S	D	R	D	R	S	R	D
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	R	S	S	S	D	D	D	S	R
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	R	S	R	S	S	S	D	S	S
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	S	D	S	S	S	R	S	R	R
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	R	S	R	R	D	D	R	S	R
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	R	D	S	S	D	D	D	D	R
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	R	S	D	S	D	D	D	D	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	D	D	D	D	R
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	R	S	S	D	R	R	R	R	R
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	S	D	S	D	D	D	D	D	D
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	D	D	D	S	S
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS	R	D	R	S	R		R	R	R
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	S	D	S	D	R	R	R	R	S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS		D	R	S	D	R	R	R	S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	R	S	R	R	S	D	R	S	R
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	D	D	S	D	D	R
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	R	D	S	S	S	S	S	S	R
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	S	D	D	R	D	R	D	D	D
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	D	D	D	S	S	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS									
Support (S)			32.70	30.60	33.90	30.00	13.50	16.80	11.40	11.40	13.50
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			17.10	0.00	11.40	10.20	13.20	12.60	21.60	21.60	23.70
Defeat (D)			0.00	20.40	5.70	10.80	24.30	18.60	18.00	18.00	13.80
Abstain (A)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No Vote Cast (Blank)			1.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total			51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	Amendment to 2009-98 section C (maximum contests)	Amendment to 2009-98	2009-99	2009-100	2009-101	2009-102	Amendment to 2009-102	2009-103 FBS only	Reconsideration of 2009-22 as amended
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	D	R	S		S
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	S	D	S		S
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	R	S	R	S	S	S
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	S	S	S	R	S	R	S		S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	R	R	R	S	S	S
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	R	S	S	S
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	D	R	S		S
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	R	R	S		S
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	R	D	R	S	S	D
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	S	S	S	R	R	R	S		S
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		D
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	R	S	R	S	R	S
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	S	S	S	R	R	R	S		S
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	D	R	S		S
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	S	S	S	R	S	D	D		S
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	D	D	S	S	S	S	S	D	S
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	D	R	R	S		S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	R	R	S		S
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	R	S	D	S	R	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	R	R	S		S
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	S	S	R	R	S	D	D		S
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	D	D	D	S	S	R	S	D	S
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	D	S		S
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	R	S	R	D	S	D
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	R	D		S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	R	R	R	S		S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	D	S	S	D	S	D	S		S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	R	R	R	S	D	S
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	S	S	S	R	S	D	S		S
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	S	R	D		S
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	R	S	D	D
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS									
Support (S)			45.30	46.50	46.80	17.40	31.50	2.70	43.20	15.00	42.30
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			0.00	0.00	1.20	31.20	12.90	39.60	0.00	4.50	0.00
Defeat (D)			5.70	4.50	3.00	2.40	6.60	8.70	7.80	7.50	8.70
Abstain (A)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total			51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	27.00	51.00

Conference - Voting Delegate	Voting Weight	Conference Type	Amendment to 2009-22	2009-22 as amended	Reconsideration of 2009-88	2009-88	Reconsideration of 2009-96	Amendment to 2009-96	Uphold LRIC ruling of 12/3/2009
America East C. Doyle	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Atlantic 10 E. Pasque	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	3.0	FBS	D	S	S	S	S	S	S
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	1.2	I	S	D	S	D	S	S	S
Big 12 L. Ebihara	3.0	FBS	S	S	D	R	D	S	S
Big East J. F. D'Antonio Jr	3.0	FBS	R	S	S	S	S	S	S
Big Sky J. Gee	1.2	FCS	R	S	D	D	D	S	S
Big South M. Eaker	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Big Ten B. Jaffee	3.0	FBS	S	S	D	D	S	S	S
Big West C. Masner	1.2	I	D	S	D	R	D	R	S
Colonial Athletic Association S. Groff	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	D	S	S
Conference USA R. Philippi	3.0	FBS	D	R	S	S	S	D	S
Horizon League E. Jacobs	1.2	I	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	D	D	S
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. J. Maher	1.2	I	S	S	D	S	S	S	S
Mid-American D. L. Gragg	1.5	FBS	S	S	S	S	S	S	D
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	1.2	FCS	S	S	D	D	S	S	S
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	1.5	FBS	D	S	S	S	S	D	S
Northeast M. Hefferan	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Ohio Valley M. Banker	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Pacific-10 K. Koong	3.0	FBS	S	S	S	D	S	S	S
Patriot League J. Kreps	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	D	S	S	S
Southeastern G. Sankey	3.0	FBS	D	R	S	S	D	S	S
Southern D. King	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Southland T. Shoemake	1.2	FCS	S	S	D	R	D	R	S
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	1.2	FCS	S	S	S	S		S	S
Sun Belt K. Keene	1.5	FBS	S	S	D	R	D	S	S
The Summit League A. Torain	1.2	I	D	S	S	S	S	S	S
West Coast K. Peters	1.2	I	R	S	S	S	S	S	S
Western Athletic R. Spear	1.5	FBS	R	S	S	S	S	S	S
Pioneer League A. Verlander (FCS voting only)	1.0	FCS							
Support (S)			31.20	43.80	37.50	33.30	36.30	42.90	49.50
Distribute for Membership Review (R)			6.90	6.00	0.00	6.90	0.00	2.40	0.00
Defeat (D)			12.90	1.20	13.50	10.80	13.50	5.70	1.50
Abstain (A)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.20	0.00	0.00
Total			51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00	51.00

# 104th Annual Convention

## LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

### SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals:

- Those letters and words that appear in *italics* and ~~striketrough~~ are to be deleted;
- Those letters and words that appear in **bold** face and are underlined are to be added; and
- Those letters and words that appear in normal text are unchanged from the current Division II legislation.]

---

#### DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

*The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division II presidents or chancellors.*

*Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.*

*The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II presidents or chancellors and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.*

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.12, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

---

#### CONSENT PACKAGE

##### NO. 2010-1 (NO. 2-2) **RECRUITING — OFFERS AND INDUCEMENTS — SUMMER FACILITY FEES FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES**

**Intent:** To permit an institution to pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by a prospective student-athlete to participate in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport during the summer prior to initial full-time enrollment at the certifying institution, provided the prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent or written offer of admission and/or financial aid.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.2, as follows:

## 13.2 OFFERS AND INDUCEMENTS

[13.2.1 through 13.2.8 unchanged.]

**13.2.9 Summer Facility Fees for Prospective Student-Athletes.**  
**An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by a prospective student-athlete to participate in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport during the summer prior to initial full-time enrollment at the certifying institution (see Bylaw 13.11.2.3), provided the prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent or written offer of admission and/or financial aid.**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** Currently, it is permissible for an institution to pay fees for the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by a student-athlete for voluntary activities in his or her sport during the summer. It is also permissible for a prospective student-athlete who has signed a National Letter of Intent or written offer of admission and/or financial aid to participate in voluntary weightlifting or conditioning activities on the institution's campus in the presence of the institution's strength and conditioning coach, provided such activities are not prearranged, and the strength and conditioning coach is performing normal duties and responsibilities in the supervision of the weight room or facility in use, and does not work directly with the prospective student-athlete. This proposal permits an institution to pay fees for the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by a prospective student-athlete who has signed a National Letter of Intent or written offer of admission and/or financial aid for voluntary activities in his or her sport during the summer prior to initial full-time enrollment at the certifying institution, just as it is currently allowed for a regularly enrolled student-athlete. The immediate effective date will allow institutions to pay the fees during summer 2010.

### NO. 2010-2 (NO. 2-3) RECRUITING AND ELIGIBILITY — ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION DATA, BANNED DRUG LIST AND INITIAL- ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS — REPORTS AND NOTIFICATION — ELIGIBILITY CENTER

**Intent:** To specify that the NCAA Eligibility Center shall provide the information contained within the disclosure reports related to admissions, graduation-rate data and academic success rate to a prospective student-athlete and his or her parents or legal guardians after he or she has registered with the Eligibility Center and the Eligibility Center has received an institution's request to add the prospective student-athlete to the institution's institutional request list; further, to specify that the Eligibility Center shall provide notification of initial-eligibility standards, the banned-drug list and information about nutritional supplements to a prospective student-athlete and his or her parents or legal guardians after he or she has regis-

tered with the Eligibility Center.

#### A. Bylaws: Amend 13.3, as follows:

### 13.3 ADMISSIONS AND GRADUATION DATA, BANNED DRUG LIST AND INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS

#### 13.3.1 Disclosure Report.

13.3.1.1 Report Publication. The Association's national office annually shall publish the admissions and graduation-rate data specified in Bylaw 30.1 and the academic success rate data specified in Constitution 3.2.4.10 and shall identify the information on an institution-specific basis.

13.3.1.2 Report Distribution. ~~Member institutions~~ **The NCAA Eligibility Center** shall provide ~~to prospective student athletes and to prospective student athletes' parents or legal guardians~~ the information contained within the report **to a prospective student-athlete and his or her parents or legal guardians after he or she has registered with the Eligibility Center and the Eligibility Center has received an institution's request to add the prospective student-athlete to the institution's institutional request list.** ~~Member institutions shall also provide the prospective student athletes and their parent(s) or legal guardians with a copy of the institution's academic success rate report.~~ The NCAA shall provide a compilation of graduation data to the prospective student-athletes' guidance offices and high school and two-year college coaches. ~~All specified information shall be provided at the earliest opportunity after the institution's first arranged in person encounter with the prospective student athlete or on request; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than the day before a prospective student athlete's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the student athlete's eligibility.~~

#### 13.3.2 Banned Drug List and Information about Nutritional Supplements.

13.3.2.1 Report Publication. The Association's national office annually shall publish the banned drug list specified in Bylaw 31.2.3.4 and shall update the list on its Web site.

13.3.2.2 Report Distribution. ~~Member institutions~~ **The NCAA Eligibility Center** shall provide ~~to all incoming prospective student athletes and to prospective student athletes' parents or legal guardians~~ the NCAA banned drug list ~~(or the NCAA Web site address at which the list is located)~~ (see Bylaw 31.2.3.4) and information about nutritional supplements **to a prospective student-athlete and his or her parents or legal guardians after he or she has registered with the Eligibility Center.** ~~The information shall be provided at the earliest practical op-~~

*portunity (e.g., after the institution's first arranged in person encounter with the prospective student athlete) or upon request; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than July 1 before the prospective student athlete's initial enrollment at the institution. For a prospective student athlete whose recruitment is initiated after July 1, the institution must send the banned drug list and information about nutritional supplements at the earliest opportunity. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student athlete's eligibility.*

13.3.3 Notification of Initial-Eligibility Standards. ~~Member institutions~~ **The NCAA Eligibility Center** shall provide ~~to high school prospective student athletes and their parents or legal guardians~~ information regarding the initial-eligibility standards contained in Bylaw 14.3 **to a prospective student-athlete and his or her parents or legal guardians after he or she has registered with the Eligibility Center.** ~~The information shall be provided at the earliest practical opportunity after the institution begins recruiting the prospective student athlete, but not later than the day prior to the student athlete's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. An institution may provide the information in hard copy or electronic form (e.g., electronic mail, link to Web site). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student athlete's eligibility.~~

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.6, as follows:

14.3.6 Notification of Initial-Eligibility Standards. ~~Member institutions~~ **The NCAA Eligibility Center** shall provide ~~to high school prospective student athletes and their parents or legal guardians~~ information regarding the initial-eligibility standards contained in Bylaw 14.3 **to a prospective student-athlete and his or her parents or legal guardians after he or she has registered with the Eligibility Center.** ~~The information shall be provided at the earliest practical opportunity after the institution begins recruiting the prospective student athlete, but not later than the day prior to the student athlete's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. An institution may provide the information in hard copy or electronic form (e.g., electronic mail, link to Web site). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student athlete's eligibility.~~

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010, for all prospective student-athletes who register with the NCAA Eligibility Center on or after August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** Current legislation places the burden on institutions to distribute information that could be provided to prospective student-athletes by the Eligibility Center. The information related to admissions, graduation-rate data and the

academic success rate is already collected and published by the NCAA. The creation of the Eligibility Center has provided increased efficiency and customer service to prospective student-athletes and their parents or legal guardians. This proposed role in the central coordination and distribution of required reports would enhance the Eligibility Center's service to the membership. The close relationship between the NCAA national office and the Eligibility Center would facilitate the sharing of the necessary data. The required information could be provided to prospective student-athletes by the most efficient method (e.g., e-mail or other technology), as determined by the Eligibility Center. This shift in report distribution would merely be administrative in nature. Institutions would remain responsible for responding to any questions raised by prospective student-athletes and their parents or legal guardians. The Eligibility Center will begin performing these duties for all prospective student-athletes who register with the NCAA Eligibility Center on or after August 1, 2010.

**NO. 2010-3 (NO. 2-5) RECRUITING — TRYOUT EXCEPTIONS — USE OF INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES**

**Intent:** To establish a tryout exception that permits a group that includes prospective student-athletes to use an institution's facilities for physical activities without the use being considered a tryout, provided the physical activities are related to a sport that is not sponsored by the institution on the varsity intercollegiate level; further, to establish a tryout exception that permits an institution's athletics department staff members and representatives of its athletics interests to be involved in the conduct and administration of the use of a member institution's facilities for physical activities by a group that includes prospective student-athletes, as specified.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.11, as follows:

**13.11 TRYOUTS**

13.11.1 Prohibited Activities. A member institution, on its campus or elsewhere, shall not conduct (or have conducted on its behalf) any physical activity (e.g., practice session or test/tryout) at which one or more prospective student-athletes (as defined in Bylaw 13.11.1.1) reveal, demonstrate or display their athletics abilities in any sport except as provided in Bylaws 13.11.2 and 13.11.3.

[13.11.1.1 through 13.11.2.6.2 unchanged.]

13.11.3 Tryout Exceptions.

[13.11.3.1 through 13.11.3.8 unchanged.]

**13.11.3.9 Use of Facilities for Activities Related to a Non-sponsored Sport. The use of a member institution's facilities for physical activities by a group that includes prospective student-athletes shall not be considered a tryout, provided the physical activities are related to a sport that is not sponsored by the institution at the varsity intercollegiate level.**

**13.11.3.10 Additional Permissible Facility Usage. The use of institutional facilities for physical activities by a group that**

**includes prospective student-athletes, not otherwise permitted in these bylaws, may still be permissible and not considered a tryout provided:**

- (a) The institution's athletics department staff or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are not involved in the promotion of the activity;**
- (b) The institution's athletics department staff or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are not involved in the solicitation of any individual prospective student-athlete's participation in the activity;**
- (c) The institution's athletics department staff or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are not involved in the solicitation for any particular group's participation in the activity, unless the group is affiliated with an outside organization and the solicitation is consistent with institutional policies of hosting outside organizations;**
- (d) The activity is not considered a tryout camp, as defined in Bylaw 13.11.1.5;**
- (e) Involvement by the institution's athletics department staff and representatives of its athletics interests is consistent with institutional policies for hosting outside organizations; and**
- (f) Athletics department staff members and representatives of its athletics interests remain subject to all applicable NCAA recruiting legislation during the event.**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** Currently, under the tryout exception that allows the use of a member institution's facilities by prospective student-athletes for activities not involving the institution's staff, athletics department staff members or representatives of the institution's athletics interests may not be involved in the conduct or administration of the activity. For example, athletics department staff members may not sell concessions, apparel or work at a scorer's table. Institutions depend on such activities to generate critical revenue for their departments, and for these activities to happen, it is often necessary for a member of the athletics department staff to administer aspects related to the activity. The existing legislation hinders access to collegiate facilities and, thus, hinders community relationships, which is contrary to the intent of the Division II Strategic Positioning Platform. Further, establishing an exception to the tryout restrictions in those instances in which the physical activities are related to a sport that is not sponsored by the institution on the intercollegiate level would not diminish either the intent or impact of the tryout restrictions, but rather would allow athletics department staff members an additional level of involvement in the conduct of these events, most of which are hosted for fundraising purposes.

**NO. 2010-4 (NO. 2-7) ELIGIBILITY — FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS — TEST-SCORE REQUIREMENT — EXCEPTION — INSTITUTIONS LOCATED IN PUERTO RICO — PRUEBA DE APTITUD ACADEMICA**

**Intent:** To create an exception to the test-score requirement for initial eligibility to specify that a prospective student-athlete entering an institution located in Puerto Rico may use a minimum combined score on the Prueba de Aptitud Académica verbal and math reasoning sections of 730 to satisfy such test-score requirement.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.3, as follows:

**14.3 FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS**

14.3.1 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition. A student-athlete who enrolls in a Division II institution as an entering freshman with no previous full-time college attendance shall meet the following academic requirements, as certified by the NCAA Eligibility Center, and approved by the Executive Committee, and any applicable institutional and conference regulations, to be considered a qualifier and thus be eligible for financial aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence.

14.3.1.1 Qualifier. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who presented the following minimum academic qualifications:

[14.3.1.1-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) A minimum combined score on the SAT verbal/critical reasoning and math sections of 820 or a minimum sum score of 68 on the ACT. The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing or regional testing dates (see Bylaw 14.3.1.3)].

**14.3.1.1.1 Exception — Institutions Located in Puerto Rico. A prospective student-athlete entering an institution located in Puerto Rico may use a minimum combined score on the Prueba de Aptitud Académica verbal and math reasoning sections of 730 to satisfy the test-score requirement in Bylaw 14.3.1.1-(b).**

[14.3.1.1.1 through 14.3.1.1.1.1 renumbered as 14.3.1.1.2 through 14.3.1.1.2.1, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010, for those students first entering a collegiate institution in Puerto Rico full time on or after August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** The Prueba de Aptitud Académica (PAA) is an aptitude test created by The College Board and administered to secondary school students in Puerto Rico. It is used as an entrance exam to universities and colleges in

Puerto Rico. The PAA is administered in Spanish, but it is not a translation of the SAT. Since the majority of instruction at Puerto Rican institutions is conducted in Spanish, the PAA should be accepted for the purpose of meeting the test-score requirements for initial eligibility for student-athletes attending an institution located in Puerto Rico. Data available demonstrates that the PAA is similar to the SAT in its ability to predict college academic outcomes for students attending an institution in Puerto Rico. Data further indicates that a combined score on the PAA verbal and math reasoning sections of 730 is at approximately the same point on the overall distribution of test scores (one standard deviation below the average of all test-takers) as 820 on the SAT and 68 on the ACT. This score on the PAA, in addition to meeting all other academic qualifications for initial eligibility, would be sufficient for initial-eligibility certification of student-athletes entering an institution located in Puerto Rico.

---

#### PRESIDENTS COUNCIL LIFE IN THE BALANCE PACKAGE

##### \*NO. 2010-5 (NO. 2-11) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FALL SPORTS

**Intent:** In cross country, field hockey, football, golf, soccer, tennis and women's volleyball, to amend the playing and practice seasons legislation, as follows: (1) Amend the first date of practice in the championship segment (in golf and tennis, for an institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches during the fall, or an institution that declares fall as its institution's championship segment); (2) Specify limitations on preseason practice activities prior to the first day of classes; (3) Amend the first contest or date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment (in golf and tennis, for an institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches during the fall, or an institution that declares fall as its institution's championship segment); (4) In field hockey and soccer, to reduce the maximum number of contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted from 20 to 18; and (5) In women's volleyball, to reduce the maximum number of dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted from 28 to 26.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.6.3, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.1.6.3 Computation and Recording of Hour Limitations.

[17.1.6.3.1 through 17.1.6.3.4 unchanged.]

17.1.6.3.5 Preseason Practice. Daily and weekly hour limitations do not apply to countable athletically related activities occurring during preseason practice before the first day of classes or the first scheduled contest, whichever is earlier. See Bylaws 17.5.2.2, 17.8.2.2, 17.9.2.2, 17.9.2.3, 17.10.5.1.1, 17.19.2.2, 17.23.5.1.1 and

**17.25.2.2.2.**

[Remainder of 17.1.6.3 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.5 CROSS COUNTRY. Regulations for computing the cross country playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.5.1 through 17.5.1.1 unchanged.]

**17.5.2 Preseason Practice.**

**17.5.2.1** First Date of Practice — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in cross country in the championship segment before 17 days prior to the first permissible date of competition **or five days prior to the first day of classes, whichever is earlier.**

**17.5.2.2** Preseason Activities Prior to the First Day of Classes. **During the preseason practice period prior to the first day of classes, student-athletes shall not engage in more than six hours of countable athletically related activities per day, only five of which may be devoted to physical activities (e.g., practice, weight training, conditioning). In addition, any session with physical activities shall not exceed three hours in length. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between any session occurring that day. During this time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities (e.g., weight-lifting) however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.**

17.5.3 First Date of Competition— Championship Segment. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding ~~August 30~~ **September 6.**

[Remainder of 17.5 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.8, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.8 FIELD HOCKEY. Regulations for computing the field hockey playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.8.1 unchanged.]

**17.8.2 Preseason Practice.**

**17.8.2.1** First Date of Practice — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in field hockey in the championship segment before 17 days prior to the first ~~permissible date of competition~~ **contest or five days prior to the first day of classes, whichever is earlier.**

**17.8.2.2** Preseason Activities Prior to the First day of Class-

**es. During the preseason practice period prior to the first day of classes, student-athletes shall not engage in more than six hours of countable athletically related activities per day, only five of which may be devoted to physical activities (e.g., practice, weight training, conditioning). In addition, any session with physical activities shall not exceed three hours in length. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between any session occurring that day. During this time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities (e.g., weight-lifting); however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.**

17.8.3 First Contest — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not engage in its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding ~~August 30~~ **September 6**.

[17.8.3.1 unchanged.]

[17.8.4 through 17.8.6 unchanged.]

17.8.7 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.

17.8.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution's field hockey playing season in any one year to ~~20~~ **18** contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition during another segment, except for those contests or dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.8.7.3, 17.8.7.4 and 17.8.7.5.

[17.8.7.1.1 unchanged.]

17.8.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than ~~20~~ **18** field hockey contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition in field hockey during another segment. This limitation includes those contests or dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

[Remainder of 17.8 unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.9, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.9 FOOTBALL. Regulations for computing the football playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.9.1 unchanged.]

17.9.2 Preseason Practice.

17.9.2.1 First Practice Date — Championship Segment. A

member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions in the championship segment, for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team before 21 days prior to the first permissible ~~date of competition~~ **contest or seven days prior to the first day of classes, whichever is earlier.**

[17.9.2.2 through 17.9.2.2.1 unchanged.]

17.9.2.3 Preseason Activities After Five-Day Acclimatization Period. The remaining preseason practice period shall be conducted as follows:

[17.9.2.3-(a) through 17.9.2.3-(b) unchanged.]

(c) Student-athletes shall not engage in more than five hours of on-field practice activities on those days during which more than one practice is permitted. **Any on-field practice activities shall not exceed three hours in length;** and

[17.9.2.3-(d) through 17.9.2.3.2 unchanged.]

17.9.3 First Contest — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding ~~August 30~~ **September 6**.

[Remainder of 17.9 unchanged.]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.10 GOLF. Regulations for computing the golf playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.10.1 through 17.10.5 unchanged.]

17.10.5.1 Exception — Alternate Playing Season. An institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches during the fall; or an institution that declares fall as its institution's championship segment per Bylaw 20.10.4.3, may use the playing season dates for sports that conduct a fall championship. Multi-day tournaments (up to a maximum of five tournaments) may count as one date of the 24 practice or competition dates, regardless of the number of days of the tournament. Further, an institution that uses this exception and discontinues its championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of 45 consecutive calendar days available during the non-championship segment. The institution is eligible for the NCAA championship.

	Fall (Championship)	Spring (Championship)
Practice	17 days prior to the first permissible date of competition <b><u>or five days prior</u></b>	February 15

	<u>to the first day of classes, whichever is earlier</u>	
Competition	Thursday preceding <del>August 30</del> <u>September 6</u>	February 15
End date for practice and competition	November 15	Seven days prior to final examination period.

**17.10.5.1.1 Alternative Playing Season — Preseason Activities Prior to the First Day of Classes. During the preseason practice period prior to the first day of classes, student-athletes shall not engage in more than six hours of countable athletically related activities per day, only five of which may be devoted to physical activities (e.g., practice, weight training, conditioning). In addition, any session with physical activities shall not exceed three hours in length. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between any session occurring that day. During this time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities (e.g., weight-lifting); however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.**

[Remainder of 17.10 unchanged.]

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.19 SOCCER. Regulations for computing the soccer playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.19.1 unchanged.]

**17.19.2 Preseason Practice.**

**17.19.2.1 First Date of Practice — Championship Segment.** A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in soccer in the championship segment before 17 days prior to the first ~~permissible date of competition~~ **contest or five days prior to the first day of classes, whichever is earlier.**

**17.19.2.2 Preseason Activities Prior to the First Day of Classes. During the preseason practice period prior to the first day of classes, student-athletes shall not engage in more than six hours of countable athletically related activities per day, only five of which may be devoted to physical activities (e.g., practice, weight training, conditioning). In addition,**

**any session with physical activities shall not exceed three hours in length. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between any session occurring that day. During this time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities (e.g., weight-lifting); however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.**

17.19.3 First ~~Date of Competition~~ **Contest** — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not play its first contest with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding ~~August 30~~ **September 6.**

[17.19.3.1 unchanged.]

[17.19.4 through 17.19.6 unchanged.]

**17.19.7 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.**

17.19.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution's soccer playing season in any one year to ~~20~~ **18** contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition during another segment, except for those contests and/or dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.19.7.3, 17.19.7.4 and 17.19.7.5.

[17.19.7.1.1 unchanged.]

17.19.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than ~~20~~ **18** soccer contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition in soccer during another segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

[Remainder of 17.19 unchanged.]

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 17.23, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.23 TENNIS. Regulations for computing the tennis playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.23.1 through 17.23.5 unchanged.]

17.23.5.1 Exception — Alternate Playing Season. An institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches during the fall; or an institution that declares fall as its institution's championship segment per Bylaw 20.10.4.3, may use the playing season dates for sports that conduct a fall championship. Further, an institution that uses this exception and discontinues its champi-

onship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment. The institution is eligible for the NCAA championship.

	Fall (Championship)	Spring (Championship)
Practice	17 days prior to the first permissible date of competition <u>or five days prior to the first day of classes, whichever is earlier</u>	February 15
Competition	Thursday preceding <del>August 30</del> <u>September 6</u>	February 15
End date for practice and competition	November 15	Seven days prior to final examination period.

**17.23.5.1.1 Alternative Playing Season — Preseason Activities Prior to the First Day of Classes. During the preseason practice period prior to the first day of classes, student-athletes shall not engage in more than six hours of countable athletically related activities per day, only five of which may be devoted to physical activities (e.g., practice, weight training, conditioning). In addition, any session with physical activities shall not exceed three hours in length. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between any session occurring that day. During this time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities (e.g., weight-lifting); however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.**

[Remainder of 17.23 unchanged.]

#### H. Bylaws: Amend 17.25, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.25 VOLLEYBALL, MEN'S AND WOMEN'S. Regulations for computing the volleyball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.25.1 through 17.25.1.9.1 unchanged.]

17.25.2 Volleyball — Women's.

[17.25.2.1 unchanged.]

17.25.2.2 **Preseason Practice.**

**17.25.2.2.1 First Date of Practice — Championship Segment — Women. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in women's volleyball in the championship segment before 17 days prior to the first permissible date of competition or five days prior to the first day of classes, whichever is earlier.**

**17.25.2.2.2 Preseason Activities Prior to the First Day of Classes. During the preseason practice period prior to the first day of classes, student-athletes shall not engage in more than six hours of countable athletically related activities per day, only five of which may be devoted to physical activities (e.g., practice, weight training, conditioning). In addition, any session with physical activities shall not exceed three hours in length. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three continuous hours of recovery time between any session occurring that day. During this time, student-athletes may not attend any meetings or engage in other athletically related activities (e.g., weight-lifting); however, time spent receiving medical treatment and eating meals may be included as part of the recovery time.**

17.25.2.3 First Date of Competition — Championship Segment — Women. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment before the Thursday preceding ~~August 30~~ September 6.

[17.25.3.1 unchanged.]

[17.25.2.4 through 17.25.2.6 unchanged.]

17.25.2.7 Number of Dates of Competition — Women.

17.25.2.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional — Women. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution's women's volleyball playing season to ~~28~~ 26 dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and four during another segment, except for those dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.25.2.7.3, 17.25.2.7.4 and 17.25.2.7.5.

[17.25.2.7.1.1 unchanged.]

17.25.2.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete — Women. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in ~~28~~ 26 dates of competition in women's volleyball during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and four during another segment. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

[Remainder of 17.25 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010; however, contracts signed before August 6,

2009, for contests or dates of competition occurring between August 26, 2010, and September 1, 2010, may be honored.

**Rationale:** After the 2009 Convention, the presidents and chancellors directed the governance structure to review the playing and practice seasons legislation to ensure its alignment with the division's Strategic Positioning Platform and the principle of "life in the balance." The proposal amends the start date of the pre-season practice period, the first date of competition and the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in specific sports. The proposal also adds limitations on physical activities during the preseason practice period before the first day of classes to reduce the risk of student-athlete injury and heat-related illnesses. The proposal strengthens the principle of balance because it will reduce the number of days that student-athletes are on campus prior to classes beginning at the institution. In addition, the proposed changes will likely result in less missed class time, missed study time and time away from campus. The proposed reductions in specified sports are necessary due to the fall sports season occurring with one less week overall. Finally, the change will have the incidental benefit of reducing costs for institutions for expenses associated with housing and feeding student-athletes prior to the general student body arriving on campus, travel and/or game-related expenses.

**\*NO. 2010-5-1      PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FALL  
SPORTS — FIELD HOCKEY — MAXIMUM  
NUMBER OF CONTESTS — EFFECTIVE DATE**

**Intent:** To amend Proposal No. 2010-5 in field hockey to delay the effective date of the reduction of the maximum number of contests until August 1, 2011.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.8.7, as follows:

[Roll Call]

**17.8.7 Number of Contests and Dates of Competition.**

17.8.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution's field hockey playing season in any one year to 18 contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition during another segment, except for those contests or dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.8.7.3, 17.8.7.4 and 17.8.7.5.

[17.8.7.1.1 unchanged.]

17.8.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 18 field hockey contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition in field hockey during another segment. This limitation includes those contests or dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

[Remainder of 17.8 unchanged.]

**Source:** Northeast-10 Conference

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2011

**Rationale:** The 2010 National Championships Fall Festival will occur November 30-December 4, with the field hockey championship occurring December 4. This is three weeks later than the traditional field hockey championship date, which normally occurs the second weekend in November. Due to this change, the championship segment is 13 weeks. The original intent of the contest reduction in the package was to account for a shorter championship segment, but the 2010 field hockey season will be two weeks longer. Delaying the effective date for the reduction to the maximum number of contests is in the best interest of the sport and the student-athletes. The proposed 18-contest maximum during 11 weeks (accounting for two weeks of NCAA championship play) does not allow for consistent scheduling of two games per week, which is the average number of contests played per week in field hockey, according to NCAA research. This change affects the 24 institutions sponsoring field hockey in Division II, and will not affect the proposed first practice or contest date in the Life in the Balance fall proposal. Beginning in 2011, when there is no fall festival, the 18 games in an eight-week regular season is reasonable and appropriate.

**Committee Position:** (Legislation Committee): The committee agreed to oppose this amendment-to-amendment. The committee noted that historically, all sports that conclude a season in a championship festival have to adjust championship season schedules to account for the festival dates. The committee further noted that although the fall sports proposal will change how institutions that sponsor field hockey traditionally schedule contests in the championship segment, the amendments in the fall sports proposal will impact all fall sports. As such, the proposal should be voted on as a whole for a fair and balanced treatment to all fall sports.

**\*NO. 2010-6 (NO. 2-12)      PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
SPRING SPORTS**

**Intent:** In baseball, to reduce the maximum number of contests from 56 to 50 and in golf, to reduce the maximum number of dates of competition from 24 to 21; further, in softball, to eliminate the tournament dates legislation.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.2, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.2 BASEBALL. Regulations for computing the baseball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.2.1 through 17.2.6 unchanged.]

**17.2.7 Number of Contests.**

17.2.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to ~~56~~ **50** contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under Bylaws 17.2.7.3, 17.2.7.4 and 14.7.5.

[17.2.7.1.1 unchanged.]

17.2.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in ~~56~~ **50** baseball contests. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior or freshman team of the institution.

[Remainder of 17.2 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.10 GOLF. Regulations for computing the golf playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.10.1 through 17.10.6 unchanged.]

17.10.7 Number of Dates of Competition.

17.10.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the permissible golf playing season to ~~24~~ **21** dates of competition, except for those dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.10.7.3, 17.10.7.4 and 17.10.7.5 (see Bylaw 20.10.3.5 for minimum contests and participants requirements).

[17.10.7.1.1 through 17.10.7.1.3 unchanged.]

17.10.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in ~~24~~ **21** dates of competition in golf. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

[Remainder of 17.10 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.20, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.20 SOFTBALL. Regulations for computing the softball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.20.1 through 17.20.6 unchanged.]

17.20.7 Number of Contests.

17.20.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in softball during the institution's softball playing season to 56 contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under Bylaws 17.20.7.3, 17.20.7.4 and 17.20.7.5.

~~17.20.7.1.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a softball tournament shall be counted as one contest, and not more~~

~~than 10 tournaments shall be scheduled in an academic year. For purposes of this legislation, a tournament shall be defined as an intercollegiate athletics event in which all the following conditions are satisfied:~~

- ~~(a) The event is a series of consecutive athletics contests that culminate in the designation of one team champion. Teams may advance through a single elimination, double elimination or pool play bracket structure;~~
- ~~(b) The event is not longer than five days in duration with a maximum of four contests per team scheduled on any one day. Competition may be held at more than one site; and~~
- ~~(c) Competing teams are selected (and may be seeded according to athletics ability) in advance of the competition.~~

[17.20.7.1.2 renumbered as 17.20.7.1.1, unchanged.]

17.20.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in 56 softball contests (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution).

~~17.20.7.2.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a softball tournament shall be counted as one contest, and not more than 10 tournaments may be scheduled in an academic year.~~

[Remainder of 17.20 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010

**Rationale:** After the 2009 Convention, the presidents and chancellors directed the governance structure to review the playing and practice seasons legislation to ensure its alignment with the division's Strategic Positioning Platform and the principle of "life in the balance." This proposal reduces the maximum number of contests in baseball and golf by approximately 10 percent. In addition, the proposal amends how an institution shall count contests in softball. Specifically, the change would require institutions to count each softball contest in a tournament as one contest against the maximum limitations. The proposed changes would likely result in less missed class time, missed study time and time away from campus for baseball, golf and softball student-athletes, which should contribute to improved academic performance overall. Finally, the change will have the incidental benefit of reducing costs for institutions for expenses associated with travel and/or game-related expenses.

**\*NO. 2010-7 (NO. 2-9) PLAYING AND PRACTICE  
SEASONS — WINTER BREAK**

**Intent:** To specify that a student-athlete shall not participate in any voluntary athletically related activities on campus from December 20 through December 26, unless the facility is open to the general student body; further, in basketball, swimming and diving, indoor track and field, and wrestling, to specify that a student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.6, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.1.6 Time Limits for Athletically Related Activities. In all sports, the following time limitations shall apply:

[17.1.6.1 through 17.1.6.5 unchanged.]

17.1.6.6 Additional Restrictions.

[17.1.6.6.1 through 17.1.6.6.2.1 unchanged.]

**17.1.6.6.3 Limitations on Voluntary Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any voluntary athletically related activities on campus from December 20 through December 26, unless the facility is open to the general student body. (See Bylaw 17.02.1.2.)**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.3 BASKETBALL. Regulations for computing the basketball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.3.1 through 17.3.3.1 unchanged.]

**17.3.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1).**

[17.3.4 through 17.3.8.5 renumbered as 17.3.5 through 17.3.9.5, unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.22, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.22 SWIMMING AND DIVING. Regulations for computing the swimming and diving playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.22.1 through 17.22.3 unchanged.]

**17.22.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1).**

[17.22.4 through 17.22.9.2 renumbered as 17.22.5 through 17.22.10.2, unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.24, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.24 TRACK AND FIELD, INDOOR/OUTDOOR. Regulations for computing the indoor/outdoor track and field playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.24.1 through 17.24.3 unchanged.]

**17.24.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. An indoor track and field student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1).**

[17.24.4 through 17.24.9.2 renumbered as 17.24.5 through 17.24.10.2, unchanged.]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.27, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.27 WRESTLING. Regulations for computing the wrestling playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.27.1 through 17.27.3 unchanged.]

**17.27.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1).**

[17.27.4 through 17.27.9.2 renumbered as 17.27.5 through 17.27.10.2, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010; however, contracts signed before August 6, 2009, for contests or dates of competition occurring between December 20, 2010, and December 26, 2010, may be honored.

**Rationale:** After the 2009 Convention, the presidents and chancellors directed the governance structure to review the playing and practice seasons legislation to ensure its alignment with the division's Strategic Positioning Platform and the principle of "life in the balance." This proposal establishes a "dead" period during the championship segment for winter sports, during which it would not be permissible for an institution to have practice, competition or other countable athletically related activities. It also establishes a "dead period" during the same dates for all sports during the winter break, during which it would not be permissible for a student-athlete to participate in voluntary athletically related activities on campus, unless the facility is open to the general student body. This seven-day period (December 20 through 26) will allow student-athletes to travel home during the winter break, work or simply relax. In addition, institutional athletics personnel (e.g., coaches, facilities managers, athletic trainers) will be able to achieve work-life balance because they will not be required to be on campus to attend to the management of student-athletes and facilities.

**\*NO. 2010-7-1 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
WINTER BREAK — RETURN TRAVEL**

**Intent:** To amend Proposal No. 2010-7 to specify that it is permissible for an institution to travel December 20 after an away-from-home competition that occurs December 19, provided that is the earliest practical opportunity to return to campus.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.6, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.1.6 Time Limits for Athletically Related Activities. In all sports, the following time limitations shall apply:

[17.1.6.1 through 17.1.6.5 unchanged.]

17.1.6.6 Additional Restrictions.

[17.1.6.6.1 through 17.1.6.6.2.1 unchanged.]

17.1.6.6.3 Limitations on Voluntary Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any voluntary athletically related activities on campus from December 20 through December 26, unless the facility is open to the general student body. (See Bylaw 17.02.1.2.)

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.3 BASKETBALL. Regulations for computing the basketball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.3.1 through 17.3.3.1 unchanged.]

17.3.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1). **It is permissible for an institution to travel December 20 after an away-from-home competition that occurs December 19, provided that is the earliest practical opportunity to return to campus.**

[17.3.4 through 17.3.8.5 renumbered as 17.3.5 through 17.3.9.5, unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.22, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.22 SWIMMING AND DIVING. Regulations for computing the swimming and diving playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.22.1 through 17.22.3 unchanged.]

17.22.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1). **It is permissible for an institution to travel December 20 after an away-from-home competition that occurs December 19, provided that is the earliest practical opportunity**

**to return to campus.**

[17.22.4 through 17.22.9.2 renumbered as 17.22.5 through 17.22.10.2, unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.24, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.24 TRACK AND FIELD, INDOOR/OUTDOOR. Regulations for computing the indoor/outdoor track and field playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.24.1 through 17.24.3 unchanged.]

17.24.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. An indoor track and field student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1). **It is permissible for an institution to travel December 20 after an away-from-home competition that occurs December 19, provided that is the earliest practical opportunity to return to campus.**

[17.24.4 through 17.24.9.2 renumbered as 17.24.5 through 17.24.10.2, unchanged.]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.27, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.27 WRESTLING. Regulations for computing the wrestling playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.27.1 through 17.27.3 unchanged.]

17.27.4 Limitations on Countable Athletically Related Activities — Winter Break. A student-athlete shall not participate in any countable athletically related activities from December 20 through December 26 (see Bylaw 17.02.1). **It is permissible for an institution to travel December 20 after an away-from-home competition that occurs December 19, provided that is the earliest practical opportunity to return to campus.**

[17.27.4 through 17.27.9.2 renumbered as 17.27.5 through 17.27.10.2, unchanged.]

**Source:** Great Northwest Athletic Conference

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010

**Rationale:** Due to limited travel options and safety issues, institutions need to have flexibility in the return travel restrictions at the beginning of the winter break period. The length of the games or the geographic location of the institution may impact what travel options are available. This proposal will require an institution to travel back to campus after an away-from-home competition that occurs December 19 at the earliest practical opportunity, including the option of travelling December 20. If adopted, return travel December 20 will not result in a violation or require relief through the Committee for Legislative Relief waiver process, provided it is the earliest practical opportunity to return from competition.

**Committee Position** (Legislation Committee): The committee agreed to oppose this amendment-to-amendment. The committee noted that the intent of the proposal is to have a full seven-day break, and this change reduces that benefit for winter sport student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators. The committee further noted that a common-sense approach should be used when scheduling a contest or date of competition before the winter break. Institutions are encouraged to schedule away-from-home contests or dates of competition with in-region or conference opponents that are located geographically closest to their campuses to avoid any return-travel issues.

**\*NO. 2010-8 (NO. 2-13) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — WINTER SPORTS — BASKETBALL**

**Intent:** In basketball, to reduce the maximum number of contests from 27 to 26.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.3, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.3 BASKETBALL. Regulations for computing the basketball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.3.1 through 17.3.4.1 unchanged.]

17.3.5 Number of Contests.

17.3.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition in basketball in any one year to ~~27~~ **26** contests (games or scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under Bylaws 17.3.5.3, 17.3.5.4, 17.3.5.5 and 17.3.5.6.

17.3.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in not more than ~~27~~ **26** basketball contests. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution. Further, an individual student-athlete may participate each year in only one postseason basketball tournament as a member of the institution's varsity, junior varsity or freshman team.

[Remainder of 17.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010

**Rationale:** After the 2009 Convention, the presidents and chancellors directed the governance structure to review the playing and practice seasons legislation to ensure its alignment with the division's Strategic Positioning Platform and the principle of "life in the balance." This proposal reduces the maximum number of contests in basketball from 27 to 26. This reduction is necessary due to the recommended proposal for the winter break, which would establish a "dead" period in basketball during which it would not be permissible for an institution to

have practice, competition, other countable athletically related activities or voluntary athletically related activities on campus from December 20 through December 26, thus shortening the overall length of the basketball playing season by one week. Finally, the proposal would likely result in less missed class time, missed study time and time away from campus for basketball student-athletes, which should contribute to improved academic performance overall.

---

**PERSONNEL**

**NO. 2010-9 (NO. 2-1) PERSONNEL — CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — SPORTS-SAFETY TRAINING**

**Intent:** To specify that each head coach and all other coaches who are employed full time at an institution shall maintain current certification in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use.

**Bylaws:** Amend 11.1, as follows:

11.1 CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

[11.1.1 through 11.1.5 unchanged.]

**11.1.6 Sports-Safety Training. Each head coach and all other coaches who are employed full time at an institution shall maintain current certification in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use.**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010

**Rationale:** Legislation requiring first aid, CPR and AED certification promotes student-athlete safety and well-being. A survey of the NCAA death claims since 1992 reports 60 percent of all nonvehicle-related deaths have been due to heart-related conditions and 83 percent of all deaths occurred during practice or conditioning. Although a similar proposal was defeated by the membership at the 2007 NCAA Convention, this proposal differs slightly from the previous in that it does not require the certified individual to be present during athletically related activities, nor does it specify the certifying organization. This proposal promotes and encourages the safety and well-being of student-athletes by requiring all head coaches [regardless of employment status (e.g., full time, part time, voluntary)] and all other coaches who are employed full time to maintain current certification in first aid, CPR and AED use. Additionally, Division II grant and initiative funding may be used to certify all coaches in first aid and CPR or to purchase an AED; however, it is not required for an institution to purchase an AED.

---

## RECRUITING

### \*NO. 2010-10 (NO. 2-4) RECRUITING — OFFICIAL VISIT — WRITTEN NOTICE

**Intent:** To eliminate the requirement that an institution must provide a prospective student-athlete written notice of the five official-visit limitation.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.6.1.2, as follows:

[Roll Call]

13.6.1.2 Number of Official Visits — Prospective Student-Athlete Limitation. A prospective student-athlete may take a maximum of five expense-paid visits, with no more than one permitted to any single institution. This restriction applies regardless of the number of sports in which the prospective student-athlete is involved and only for expense-paid visits to Divisions I and II institutions.

~~13.6.1.2.1 Written Notification Required. Each member institution shall be required to notify the prospective student athlete in writing, at the time of its invitation but before the visit, of the five visit limitation. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student athlete's eligibility.~~

[13.6.1.2.2 renumbered as 13.6.1.2.1, unchanged.]

**Source:** Lone Star Conference, Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and South Atlantic Conference.

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** This proposal will eliminate unnecessary paperwork and inadvertent violations due to administrative oversight. By reducing some of the administrative burdens placed on Division II compliance personnel who are charged with monitoring official visits, appropriate attention can be shifted to other areas. The immediate effective date will bring instant relief to the compliance workload. In 2004, Division I eliminated this requirement and there have not been any resulting issues with monitoring official visits.

**Committee Position** (Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and the committee agreed to oppose this proposal. The Councils and the committee noted that without the written notification requirement, prospective student-athletes may not be aware of the five-visit limitation for official visits, and will therefore not track their visits and possibly exceed the maximum number allowed. The Councils and the committee further noted that providing prospective student-athletes with written notification of the five-visit limit is not an administrative burden in that compliance administrators will still be required to monitor the rule.

---

## ELIGIBILITY

### \*NO. 2010-11 (NO. 2-6) ELIGIBILITY — CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SEASON OF ELIGIBILITY — PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZED COMPETITION PRIOR TO INITIAL COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT

**Intent:** To specify that an individual who does not enroll in a collegiate institution as a full-time student in the regular academic term that begins immediately after a one-year time period following his or her high school graduation date shall use one season of intercollegiate competition for each consecutive 12-month period after the one-year time period and before initial full-time collegiate enrollment in which the individual participates in organized competition; further, to amend the administration of the organized-competition regulations, as specified.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.4.2, as follows:

[Roll Call]

14.2.4.2 Participation in Organized Competition ~~or Training~~ Prior to Initial Collegiate Enrollment. An individual who does not enroll in a collegiate institution as a full-time student ~~during the regular academic term that is immediately following the date that the individual's high school class normally graduates from high school (or the international equivalent as specified in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility)~~ in the regular academic term that begins immediately after a one-year time period (the next opportunity to enroll after the one calendar-year period has elapsed) following his or her high school graduation date shall use ~~a~~ one season of intercollegiate competition for each ~~calendar year or sports season (following that date)~~ consecutive 12-month period after the one-year time period and before initial full-time collegiate enrollment in which the individual ~~has participated~~ participates in activities that meet the criteria set forth in organized competition per Bylaw 14.2.4.2.31.2.

~~14.2.4.2.1 Discontinued High School Enrollment. An individual who discontinues high school enrollment and subsequently participates in activities that meet the criteria set forth in Bylaw 14.2.4.2.3 shall use a season of intercollegiate competition for each calendar year or sports season of participation regardless of the date the individual's high school class normally graduates.~~

~~14.2.4.2.2 Academic Year in Residence. An individual who uses a season(s) of competition in a specific sport per Bylaw 14.2.4.2, shall fulfill an academic year in residence at any member institution prior to being eligible to represent the certifying institution in that specific sport in intercollegiate competition.~~

~~14.2.4.2.3 Activities Constituting Use of Season. An individual shall use a season of competition per Bylaw 14.2.4.2 if the individual participates in activities that meet any of the following criteria:~~

- ~~(a) Any competition or training with a team that declares itself to be professional;~~
- ~~(b) Any competition or training with a team in which compensation is provided to any of the participants (including actual and necessary expenses);~~
- ~~(c) Any individual competition or training in which any of the participants receive compensation (including actual and necessary expenses);~~
- ~~(d) Any competition pursuant to the signing of a contract for athletics participation;~~
- ~~(e) Any competition pursuant to involvement in a professional draft;~~
- ~~(f) Any competition funded by a professional sports organization, excluding not for profit organizations affiliated with professional sports organizations;~~
- ~~(g) Any competition funded by a representative of an institution's athletics interest that is not an open event; or~~
- ~~(h) Any practice with a professional athletics team (excluding a 48-hour tryout).~~

~~14.2.4.2.3.1 Actual and Necessary Expenses. For purposes of determining the use of a season of competition per Bylaw 14.2.4.2, actual and necessary expenses are limited to the following:~~

- ~~(a) Meals;~~
- ~~(b) Transportation;~~
- ~~(c) Lodging;~~
- ~~(d) Medical insurance;~~
- ~~(e) Stipend (e.g., money for gas or food); or~~
- ~~(f) Medical expenses (excluding on site treatment of an injury).~~

~~14.2.4.2.3.1.1 Exceptions — Reasonable Expenses and Fees. Reasonable expenses other than those listed above (e.g., the value of coaching, instruction and facility usage) are not considered compensation. If an individual pays a fee to participate on a team, the individual uses a season of competition only if the amount of actual and necessary expenses or other compensation received exceeds the amount of the fee.~~

~~14.2.4.2.3.1.1.1 Definition of Fee. A fee to participate on a team or club must:~~

- ~~(a) Be required of all individuals on the team or club;~~
- ~~(b) Be the same amount for all individuals on the team or club;~~
- ~~(c) Be directly used for the expenses of the team or club; and~~
- ~~(d) Not be earmarked for a specific individual or individuals.~~

#### 14.2.4.2.1 Administration of Participation in Organized Competi-

tion.

14.2.4.2.1.1 High School Graduation. An individual's high school graduation date (or the international equivalent as specified in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility) shall be considered to be the graduation date of the final high school class (e.g., junior, senior) of which he or she was a member.

14.2.4.2.1.1.1 Early High School Graduation. If an individual graduates early from high school, he or she becomes a member of that class and the date of graduation for the individual is the expected date of that class.

14.2.4.2.1.1.2 Late High School Graduation — Required Repeat Year. If an individual is required to repeat an entire year of high school attendance, he or she becomes a member of that class and the date of graduation for the individual is the expected date of that class.

14.2.4.2.1.1.3 Discontinued High School Enrollment. An individual who discontinues high school enrollment and then participates in organized competition per Bylaw 14.2.4.2.1.2 shall use one season of intercollegiate competition for each consecutive 12-month period after a one-year time period (the next opportunity to enroll after one calendar year has elapsed) following the discontinued enrollment and before initial full-time collegiate enrollment.

14.2.4.2.1.2 Organized Competition. Athletics competition shall be considered organized if any one of the following conditions exists:

- (a) Competition is scheduled in advance;
- (b) Official score is kept;
- (c) Individual or team standings or statistics are maintained;
- (d) Official timer or game officials are used;
- (e) Admission is charged;
- (f) Teams are regularly formed or team rosters are predetermined;
- (g) Team uniforms are used;
- (h) An individual or team is privately or commercially sponsored; or
- (i) The competition is either directly or indirectly sponsored, promoted or administered by an individual, an organization or any other agency.

14.2.4.2.1.3 Academic Year in Residence. An individual who uses a season of competition in a specific sport per Bylaw 14.2.4.2 shall fulfill an academic year in residence at any member institution before being eligible to represent the certifying institution in that specific sport in intercollegiate

competition.

**14.2.4.2.1.3.1 Exception.** A student who has attended a two-year or a four-year collegiate institution for at least two full-time semesters or three full-time quarters and who has satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or 12 quarter hours of transferable degree credit for each full-time academic term of attendance at the two-year or four-year collegiate institution is not required to fulfill an academic year in residence prior to being eligible to represent the certifying institution in that specific sport in intercollegiate competition. (See Bylaws 14.4 and 14.5 for progress-toward-degree and transfer requirements.)

**14.2.4.2.2 Exceptions to Participation in Organized Competition.** An individual shall not be charged with a season of intercollegiate competition, provided the individual satisfies any of the following exceptions for each consecutive 12-month period in which the individual participates in organized competition per Bylaw 14.2.4.2.1.2 following the one-year time period after the individual's high school graduation and before initial full-time collegiate enrollment.

**14.2.4.2.2.1 U.S. Armed Services Exception.** Participation in ~~activities that meet the criteria set forth in~~ **organized competition per** Bylaw 14.2.4.2.1.2 during time spent in the U.S. Armed Services shall be excepted as long as the competition is organized and administered by the military.

**14.2.4.2.2.2 National/International Competition Exception.** For a maximum of one year, participation in ~~activities that meet the criteria set forth in~~ **organized competition per** Bylaw 14.2.4.2.1.2 shall be excepted if the competition is national or international competition that includes participation in:

- (a) Official Pan American, World Championships, World Cup, World University and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;
- (b) Officially recognized training and competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts; or
- (c) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or, for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport).

~~**14.2.4.2.2.3 Postgraduate College Preparatory School Exception.** Participation in activities that meet the criteria set forth in Bylaw 14.2.4.2.3 while enrolled in a postgraduate college preparatory school shall be excepted. This exception may only be used during the initial year of enrollment in the preparatory school.~~

**14.2.4.2.2.3 Skiing Exception.** For a maximum of two years, participation in ~~activities that meet the criteria set forth in orga-~~

**nized competition per** Bylaw 14.2.4.2.1.2 shall be excepted in ~~the sport of~~ skiing when such participation is part of competition sanctioned by the U.S. Skiing Association and its international counterparts.

**14.2.4.2.3 Notification of Organized-Competition Legislation.** Institutions shall provide to high school, preparatory school, two-year and four-year college prospective student-athletes and their parents or legal guardians information regarding the organized-competition legislation contained in Bylaw 14.2.4.2. The information shall be provided at the earliest practical opportunity after the institution begins recruiting the prospective student-athlete, but not later than the day prior to the prospective student-athlete's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. An institution may provide the information in hard-copy or electronic form (e.g., electronic mail, link to Web site). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

**14.2.4.2.4 Waiver.** The Committee for Legislative Relief shall have the authority to review and grant waivers of the organized competition legislation.

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010, for individuals initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** Since January 2008, the governance structure has been examining issues related to the organized-competition legislation. There has been significant analysis of whether the frequency and level of competition, rather than compensation, should determine organized competition. Per the proposal, it will no longer be of importance if the individual, his or her teammate(s) or other individuals participating in an event received compensation, including prize money, actual and necessary expenses, etc. An expanded "grace period" would allow individuals ample time to participate in organized competition and make a decision regarding enrollment in college without compromising their opportunity to participate in Division II athletics. Further, a transfer student will not be required to serve an academic year in residence at the certifying institution if he or she transfers after meeting certain academic requirements. By presenting the certifying institution with this academic information, the transfer student would demonstrate the requisite commitment to academics. Requiring institutions to provide individuals with information regarding the organized-competition legislation ensures that individuals are provided with this information early in the recruiting process. A waiver provision specifies the committee authorized to waive the application of the organized-competition legislation. Finally, the Legislation Committee will continue to review cases processed under the organized-competition rule and report any issues to the Presidents Council.

---

## FINANCIAL AID

### NO. 2010-12 (NO. 2-8) FINANCIAL AID, PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS AND DIVISION MEMBERSHIP — SAND VOLLEYBALL

**Intent:** In sand volleyball, to establish the maximum institutional grant-in-aid equivalency limit, the playing and practice season regulations and the minimum contests and participants requirement for sports sponsorship, as specified.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5, as follows:

15.5 MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT

[15.5.1 through 15.5.1.8 unchanged.]

15.5.2 Equivalency Sports.

[15.5.2.1 through 15.5.2.1.1.1 unchanged.]

15.5.2.1.2 Women's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per Bylaw 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each women's sport, as follows:

**Sand Volleyball 5.0**

[15.5.2.1.3 through 15.5.2.2.1 unchanged.]

15.5.3 Multisport Participants. A counter who participates in two or more sports shall be counted in one or more sports as specified on the individual's financial aid agreement.

[15.5.3.1 through 15.5.3.2 unchanged.]

**15.5.3.3 Volleyball — Additional Requirements. In volleyball, a counter who participates (e.g., practices, competes) in volleyball and sand volleyball shall be counted toward institutional limits in volleyball.**

[15.5.3.3 renumbered as 15.5.3.4, unchanged.]

[Remainder of 15.5 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17, as follows:

17 Playing and Practice Seasons

[17.01 through 17.16 unchanged.]

**17.17 SAND VOLLEYBALL. Regulations for computing the sand volleyball playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)**

**17.17.1 Length of Playing Season — Championship and Non-championship Segments. The length of an institution's playing season for both segments in sand volleyball shall be limited by the dates and regulations set forth in the remainder of this section.**

**17.17.2 First Date of Practice — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in sand volleyball in the championship segment before January 10 or the**

**first day of class, whichever is earlier.**

**17.17.3 First Date of Competition — Championship Segment. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in the championship segment before February 1.**

**17.17.4 End Date of Practice and Competition — Championship Segment. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in sand volleyball in the championship segment by the last day of final examinations for the regular academic year.**

**17.17.5 First Date of Practice and Competition — Nonchampionship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions or engage in outside competition in the nonchampionship segment before September 7 or the first day of class, whichever occurs first.**

**17.17.6 End Date of Practice and Competition — Nonchampionship Segment. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition in the nonchampionship segment no later than November 15.**

**17.17.7 Number of Contests.**

**17.17.7.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in sand volleyball during the institution's sand volleyball playing season to 16 dates of competition during the segment that ends with a National Collegiate Championship event, and four dates of competition during the non-championship segment, except for those dates of competition excluded under Bylaws 17.17.7.3 and 17.17.7.4 (see Bylaw 20.10.3.5 for minimum contests and participants requirements).**

**17.17.7.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in 16 dates of competition in sand volleyball during the segment in which a National Collegiate Championship is conducted and four dates of competition during another segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.**

**17.17.7.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition shall exclude the following:**

- (a) Conference Championship. Competition in one conference championship tournament or playoff;**
- (b) Season-Ending Championship Tournament. Competition in one recognized national intercollegiate championship event in sand volleyball (e.g., National Collegiate Sand Volleyball Championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the**

close of the regular season;

- (c) Alumni Game. One contest with an alumni team of the institution;
- (d) Foreign Team in United States. A date of competition against a foreign team in the United States played in the facility in which the member institution regularly plays its home dates of competition;
- (e) Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico. Any contest played in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico by a member institution located outside those locales;
- (f) Fundraising Activity. Any activities in which student-athletes from more than one of the institution's athletics teams participate (or in individual sports per Bylaw 17.02.14.2, in which team members of that sport participate) with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds to benefit the institution's athletics or other programs, provided the student-athletes do not miss class as a result of their participation (see Bylaw 12.5.1.1);
- (g) Celebrity Sports Activity. Competition involving a maximum of two student-athletes from a member institution's team who participate in local celebrity activities in sand volleyball conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations, provided:
  - (1) The student-athletes do not miss class as a result of the participation; and
  - (2) The involvement of the student-athletes has the approval of the institution's athletics director; and
- (h) U.S. National Team. One date of competition against a U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate national governing body in that sport.

17.17.7.4 Once-in-Four-Years Exemption — Foreign Tours. An institution may exempt the dates of competition played on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaw 30.7 (see Bylaw 17.29).

17.17.8 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the championship segment except for the following:

- (a) Conditioning, Weight-Training and Skill Instruction. Student-athletes may participate in conditioning, weight-training and skill instruction in accordance with Bylaw 17.1.6.2; and
- (b) Nonchampionship Segment Activities. During the segment in which a National Collegiate Championship does not occur,

student-athletes may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation provided such activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 45 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced or on days that the institution is closed due to inclement weather, as long as no practice or competition occurs on such days. The 45 consecutive calendar days must be within the dates set forth in Bylaws 17.17.5 and 17.17.6.

17.17.8.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Management Council. An institution may pay fees associated with the use of institutional practice and competition facilities by student-athletes engaged in voluntary athletically related activities in his or her sport.

17.17.9 Camps and Clinics. There are no limits on the number of student-athletes in sand volleyball who may be employed (e.g., as counselors) in camps or clinics (see Bylaw 13.12). Currently enrolled student-athletes may not participate as campers in their institution's camps or clinics.

#### 17.17.10 Other Restrictions.

##### 17.17.10.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition.

17.17.10.1.1 In Season. A student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate sand volleyball competition for the remainder of the season if, after enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate sand volleyball squad or team, she competes or has competed as a member of any outside sand volleyball team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution's intercollegiate sand volleyball season (see Bylaw 14.7.5 for exceptions and waivers).

17.17.10.1.2 Out of Season. There are no limits to the number of student-athletes with eligibility remaining in intercollegiate sand volleyball who may practice or compete out of season on an outside, amateur sand volleyball team.

17.17.10.1.2.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff. No member of the coaching staff of a member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player or league/team administrator) at any time during the academic year, vacation periods and summer with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with eligibility remaining from the institution's sand volleyball team except as provided in Bylaws 14.7.5, 16.8.1.3.1 and 17.29.

17.17.10.1.2.2 Olympic and National Team Development Program. There are no limits on the number of student-athletes from the same institution who may participate in Olympic and national team development programs. Such programs may also include a coach and student-athlete from the same institution.

17.17.10.2 Equipment Issue, Squad Pictures. It shall be permissible to designate a single date for issuing sand volleyball equipment and for taking squad pictures after the beginning of classes in the fall term or the day before the beginning of a segment as specified in Bylaw 17.17.5.

17.17.10.2.1 Exception for Sundays. If the day before the beginning of a segment is a Sunday, the member institution may designate the preceding Saturday for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures.

[Remainder of 17 unchanged.]

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 20.10.3.5, as follows:

20.10.3.5 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contest requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

Team Sports	Minimum Contests
-------------	------------------

<b>Sand Volleyball</b>	<b>8</b>
------------------------	----------

(Note: The minimum-contest requirements set forth in Bylaws 20.10.3.5.1 through 20.10.3.5.8 apply only to the provisions of this section and do not apply to minimum-contest requirements in Bylaws 14 and 17.)

[20.10.3.5.1 through 20.10.3.5.8 unchanged.]

**20.10.3.5.9 Sand Volleyball. A member institution shall meet minimum sports sponsorship in sand volleyball by applying the following:**

- (a) No less than three of the eight contests shall be dual, one-day competitions in which all five two-person teams compete (e.g., institution versus institution on a single day on which no other competition occurs);**
- (b) The remaining number of contests shall be achieved by satisfying Bylaw 20.10.3.5.9-(a) or multi-opponent competitions. For a tournament to qualify for sports sponsorship purposes, all five two-person teams must be in competition with all other participating institutions and one institution shall be crowned champion of the tournament based on the performance of its five two-person teams;**

**(c) All other competition formats will constitute the use of a date of competition but not count towards the minimum sports sponsorship requirement; and**

**(d) Contests against a collegiate institution's club team may not be counted toward meeting the minimum-contest requirements, except for the following:**

- (1) During each intercollegiate season, one contest against a collegiate institution's club team may be used in meeting the minimum-contest requirements provided the contest is a dual, one-day competition in which all five two-person teams compete.**

[20.10.3.5.9 through 20.10.3.5.9.2 renumbered as 20.10.3.5.10 through 20.10.3.5.10.2, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010

**Rationale:** At the 2009 Convention, sand volleyball was added to the list of emerging sports for women. Establishing a maximum equivalency of five for institutions that sponsor sand volleyball provides institutions the opportunity to offer athletics aid to student-athletes consistent with the Division II Strategic Positioning Platform. It is anticipated that during the initial years of sponsorship, sand volleyball student-athletes would also participate in volleyball at institutions that sponsor both sports. Utilizing a "hierarchy model," which causes a multi-sport student-athlete who participates in sand volleyball and volleyball to count against the volleyball equivalency, precludes institutions from gaining a competitive advantage in volleyball by offering sand volleyball financial aid to student-athletes who were recruited to play volleyball. The proposed playing and practice season legislation mirrors that of the other Division II spring sports. Establishing eight as the minimum number of contests and 10 as the minimum number of participants for the contest to count toward sports sponsorship for membership will provide reasonable competitive opportunities. Finally, including additional parameters associated with the different forms of competition (e.g., dual competitions, tournaments) for meeting minimum-contest requirements provides institutions an opportunity to legitimately sponsor the sport and student-athletes a true intercollegiate sport experience.

---

## PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

*NO. 2010-13 (NO. 2-10)	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — GOLF — OUT-OF-SEASON AND NONCHAMPIONSHIP SEGMENT ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES — NONCHAMPIONSHIP SEGMENT ACTIVITIES — 60-CONSECUTIVE CALENDAR DAY PERIOD
-------------------------	---

**Intent:** In golf, to specify that during the segment in which the NCAA championship does not occur, a student-athlete may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation, provided such activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of 60 consecutive calendar days; further, to specify that an institution that declares fall as its championship segment per Bylaw 20.10.4.3 and discontinues championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of 60 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.6.2, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.1.6.2 Weekly Hour Limitations — Outside of Playing Season. Outside of the playing season during the academic year, only a student-athlete's participation in weight-training, conditioning, individual skill instruction and, in football, review of game film shall be permitted. A student-athlete's participation in such activities shall be limited to a maximum of eight hours per week, of which not more than two hours per week may be spent on individual skill workouts set forth in Bylaw 17.1.6.2.1 and, in football, review of game film. All countable athletically related activities outside the playing season are prohibited one week prior to the beginning of the final examination period through the conclusion of the institution's final examinations. Participation in voluntary individual workouts monitored by strength and conditioning personnel for safety purposes per Bylaw 17.02.1.1 shall not count against the weekly hour limitation.

[17.1.6.2.1 through 17.1.6.2.3 unchanged.]

17.1.6.2.4 Exception — Alternate Playing Season — Golf and Tennis. In golf and tennis, an institution that conducts its championship segment during the fall term must discontinue practice at the conclusion of its nonchampionship segment (**golf — designated ~~45~~ 60- or ~~60~~ 75-consecutive calendar day period; tennis — designated 45- or 60-day consecutive calendar day period**). Such a team may resume practice the day following the conclusion of the institution's final examination period for the applicable academic term or 10-consecutive calendar days before the start of the championship, whichever is earlier, provided the institution has reasonable belief that it is under consideration for selection to participate in an NCAA, NCCAA or NAIA championship event. (See Bylaws 17.10.5.1 and 17.23.5.1.)

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.10 GOLF. Regulations for computing the golf playing season are set forth in Bylaw 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (See Figure 17-1 and Figure 17-2.)

[17.10.1 through 17.10.4 unchanged.]

17.10.5 First Date of Practice and Competition — Nonchampionship Segment. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions or engage in outside competition in the nonchampionship segment before September 7 or the first day of class, whichever occurs first.

17.10.5.1 Exception — Alternate Playing Season. An institution

that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship or plays the majority of its conference matches during the fall; or an institution that declares fall as its institution's championship segment per Bylaw 20.10.4.3, may use the playing season dates for sports that conduct a fall championship. Multi-day tournaments (up to a maximum of five tournaments) may count as one date of the 24 practice or competition dates, regardless of the number of days of the tournament. Further, an institution that uses this exception and discontinues its championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of ~~45~~ 60 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment. The institution is eligible for the NCAA championship.

[Remainder of 17.10.5.1 unchanged.]

[17.10.6 through 17.10.7.5 unchanged.]

17.10.8 Out-of-Season and Nonchampionship Segment Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the championship segment except for the following:

[17.10.8-(a) unchanged.]

(b) Nonchampionship Segment Activities. During the segment in which the NCAA championship does not occur, student-athletes may participate in any practice or competition activity as permitted by other legislation provided such activity is restricted to a maximum of 24 days that occur within a period of ~~45~~ 60 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced or on days that the institution is closed due to inclement weather, as long as no practice or competition occurs on such days. Multi-day tournaments (up to a maximum of five tournaments) may count as one date of the 24 practice or competition dates, regardless of the number of days of the tournament. The ~~45~~ 60 consecutive calendar days must be within the dates set forth in Bylaws 17.10.5 and 17.10.6. It is not permissible for an institution that declares fall as its championship segment and operates on the quarter system to engage in practice and competition from the time period of seven calendar days prior to the first date of the institution's final examination period for the winter quarter until the first day of classes of the spring quarter. The days during which practice and competition is prohibited may be exempted from the period of ~~45~~ 60 consecutive calendar days.

(1) Exception. A member institution that declares fall as its institution's championship segment per Bylaw 20.10.4.3 and discontinues championship segment activities by November 1 (instead of November 15) may add 15 calendar days to the period of ~~45~~ 60 consecutive calendar days available during the nonchampionship segment (see Bylaw 17.10.5.1).

[Remainder of 17.10 unchanged.]

**Source:** Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010

**Rationale:** This proposal would benefit student-athletes by spreading out the nonchampionship segment and allowing them to avoid missing class time for several weeks in a row. The change would not increase missed class time because the 24 days of practice and competition in the nonchampionship segment would not increase and most institutions already compete in four to five tournaments during the segment. The proposal will allow institutions additional flexibility in scheduling, which is vital as many institutions do not own their golf facilities and are subject to the availability of the venues in which they compete. Competition in the nonchampionship segment has equal weight to competition in the championship segment for determination of postseason participation. Under the current nonchampionship segment model, student-athletes typically have less than a week of practice time before their first competition of the season, which leads to the majority of the first week of practice consisting of qualifying rounds because a coach has not had the opportunity to assess his or her roster. Finally, since most coaches coach both the men's and women's programs, this change will allow them to spend adequate practice time with both programs.

**Committee Position** (Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and the committee agreed to take no position on this proposal.

**\*NO. 2010-14 (NO. 2-14) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
BASKETBALL — FIRST CONTEST**

**Intent:** In basketball, to specify that a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition prior to the second Friday of November.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.3, as follows:

[Roll Call]

17.3.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball ~~before~~ **prior to the second Friday of** November ~~15~~, except as provided under Bylaw 17.3.3.1.

**Source:** Peach Belt Conference, Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010

**Rationale:** Currently, an institution shall not play its first contest against outside competition prior to November 15, aside from exceptions outlined in Bylaw 17.3.3.1. This proposal does not change that date substantially, it simply allows institutions to schedule that first contest on a weekend night. This proposal will not allow an institution to compete earlier than what is allowed under current legislation as most Division II basketball teams compete in exempted contests on or soon after November 1. The

proposal will only change the date for the first permissible “countable” contest. This change will also provide a benefit to student-athletes as no season-opening games or events will take place during the week and teams can also schedule “countable” games earlier in the season to provide flexibility for conference playing dates that occur during final examination periods. Further, this change is easy to administer as all schools can easily determine when the second Friday is and coaches can better schedule knowing the season starts on a weekend every year. Adoption of this proposal will likely result in all Division II basketball teams officially starting their season on the same day.

**Committee Position** (Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and the committee agreed to oppose this proposal. The Councils and the committee noted that the proposed amendment increases the length of the regular playing season, while shortening the length of the preseason practice period. The Councils and the committee also noted that the proposal could lead to season/sport overlap during the championship segments. The Councils and the committee further noted that some institutions prefer to have more campus engagements on weekdays rather than weekends because there are more campus personnel and students available to attend contests during the week. Finally, the Councils and the committee noted that the proposed amendment is contrary to the Life in the Balance initiative.

## 2010 NCAA CONVENTION DIVISION II VOTING RESULTS

(Saturday, January 16, Business Session)

PROPOSAL NO.	BUSINESS SESSION	RESULT	COUNT (actual count or paddle)
*#1	II	Adopted	Paddle
#2	II	Adopted	Paddle
*#3	II	Adopted	Paddle
#4	II	Adopted	Paddle
5	II	Adopted	207-72-1
5-1	II	Adopted	107-45-129
6	II	Adopted	241-37-2
7	II	Adopted	171-108-2
7-1	II	Adopted	234-36-10
8	II	Adopted	198-79-2
9	II	Adopted	Paddle
*10	II	Adopted	175-105-0
11	II	Adopted	218-59-3
12	II	Adopted	Paddle
13	II	Adopted	244-8-26
14	II	Defeated	136-141-2
Reconsideration of 14	II	Adopted	136-131-0

\* Effective Immediately.

# Adopted as part of Consent Package.

	Test Vote 1	Test Vote 2	Proposal No. 5-1	Proposal No. 5	Proposal No. 6	Proposal No. 7-1	Proposal No. 7	Proposal No. 8	Proposal No. 10	Proposal No. 11	Proposal No. 13	Proposal No. 14	Proposal No. 14 Reconsider?	Proposal No. 14 Revote
<b>DIVISION II — VOTING RESULTS</b>														
Abilene Christian University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Adams State College	A	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		
Adelphi University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Albany State University (Georgia)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Alderson-Broaddus College	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
American International College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anderson University (South Carolina)	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Angelo State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Arkansas Tech University	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Armstrong Atlantic State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ashland University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Assumption College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Augusta State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Augustana College (South Dakota)	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Barry University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Barton College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Bellarmino University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Belmont Abbey College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Bemidji State University	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Benedict College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Bentley University	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bloomfield College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	N
Bluefield State College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bowie State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Brevard College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Brigham Young University, Hawaii	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Caldwell College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California Collegiate Athletic Association	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	N		
California State University, Monterey Bay	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California State University, Chico	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y		
California State University, Los Angeles	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N
California State University, San Bernardino	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N		
California State University, Stanislaus	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N				
California University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Cameron University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Carson-Newman College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Catawba College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Central State University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central Washington University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chadron State College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Chaminade University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Chestnut Hill College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania			A	N		N	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Chowan University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Christian Brothers University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Claflin University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Clark Atlanta University			A	N	Y	Y	A	A	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Clayton State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colorado Christian University	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colorado School of Mines	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colorado State University-Pueblo	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Columbus State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concord University	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia College (New York)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia University, St. Paul	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Conference Carolinas	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Converse College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Dallas Baptist University	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Davis and Elkins College	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Delta State University	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Dixie State College of Utah	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Dominican College (New York)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Dowling College		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N

Drury University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
East Central University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
East Coast Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Eastern New Mexico University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Eckerd College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	N
Elizabeth City State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Emporia State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fairmont State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fayetteville State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Felician College	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ferris State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Flagler College	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Florida Institute of Technology	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Florida Southern College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fort Hays State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fort Lewis College	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Francis Marion University	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Franklin Pierce University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Gannon University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgia College & State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	Y
Georgia Southwestern State University	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgian Court University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Glenville State College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Goldey-Beacom College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grand Canyon University	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grand Valley State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N
Great Lakes Valley Conference	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Great Northwest Athletic Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Gulf South Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Harding University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	N	N
Hawaii Pacific University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Heartland Conference	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Henderson State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Hillsdale College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Holy Family University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Humboldt State University	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N

Johnson C. Smith University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Keene State College	N													
Kentucky State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Kentucky Wesleyan College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Lake Erie College	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y		Y
Lake Superior State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lander University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Le Moyne College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LeMoyne-Owen College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Lenoir-Rhyne University				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Lewis University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Limestone College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Lincoln Memorial University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Lincoln University (Missouri)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	N
Lone Star Conference	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lynn University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	N
Mars Hill College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Mercy College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Mercyhurst College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	N
Merrimack College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mesa State College	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Metropolitan State College of Denver	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Michigan Technological University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	N
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Midwestern State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Millersville University of Pennsylvania		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Minnesota State University Moorhead	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota State University, Mankato	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Missouri Southern State University	Y	N	A	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Missouri University of Science and Technology	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	N		
Missouri Western State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Molloy College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Montana State University-Billings	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Morehouse College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Mount Olive College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
New Mexico Highlands University	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
New York Institute of Technology	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N

Newbury College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Newman University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Georgia College & State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northeast-10 Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northeastern State University	Y	N	A	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northern Kentucky University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northern Michigan University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	A	N	N	N
Northern State University		N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Northwest Missouri State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northwest Nazarene University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northwood University (Michigan)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Notre Dame de Namur University	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Nova Southeastern University	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Nyack College	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Valley University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Oklahoma Panhandle State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N
Ouachita Baptist University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Pace University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pacific West Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		
Peach Belt Conference	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Pfeiffer University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Philadelphia University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pittsburg State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Post University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Queens College (New York)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Queens University of Charlotte	Y	N	A	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Quincy University	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Regis University (Colorado)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Rockhurst University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Rollins College	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saginaw Valley State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Saint Anselm College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Saint Leo University	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Michael's College	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Salem International University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
San Francisco State University	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Seattle Pacific University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N

Seton Hill University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shaw University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Shepherd University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	N	N	N
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Sonoma State University	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Atlantic Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southeastern Oklahoma State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Arkansas University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Southern Connecticut State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Southern New Hampshire University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Southwest Baptist University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southwest Minnesota State University	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		
Southwestern Oklahoma State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Andrews Presbyterian College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	N
Saint Augustine's College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
St. Cloud State University	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Edward's University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Martin's University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
St. Mary's University (Texas)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
St. Paul's College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
St. Thomas Aquinas College	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		
Stillman College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Stonehill College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	N
Sunshine State Conference	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tarleton State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas A&M International University	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Texas A&M University-Commerce	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas Woman's University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
The College of Saint Rose	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tiffin University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Truman State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tusculum College	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
University of Alabama in Huntsville	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Alaska Anchorage	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Alaska Fairbanks	Y	N	A	N	A	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
University of Arkansas, Monticello	Y	N	N											
University of Bridgeport	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	N	N	N

University of California, San Diego	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Central Missouri	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Central Oklahoma	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Charleston (West Virginia)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Findlay	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Hawaii at Hilo	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Indianapolis	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Mary	Y	N	A		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
University of Massachusetts Lowell	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Minnesota Duluth	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Minnesota, Crookston	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
University of Missouri, St. Louis	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y		N				
University of Montevallo	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Nebraska at Kearney	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Nebraska at Omaha	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of New Haven	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	N
University of North Alabama	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		
University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Puerto Rico, Bayamon	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y
University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez Campus	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	Y
University of South Carolina Aiken	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Tampa	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of Texas of the Permian Basin	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of the District of Columbia	Y		Y	N	A	Y	N	N	N	N	A	N		N
University of the Incarnate Word	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of the Sciences in Philadelphia	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of West Alabama	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
University of West Florida	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	N
University of West Georgia	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin-Parkside	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Upper Iowa University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Valdosta State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Virginia State University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Virginia Union University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Washburn University of Topeka	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wayne State College (Nebraska)	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Wayne State University (Michigan)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N

West Liberty University	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Texas A&M University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia State University	Y	N	A	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia Wesleyan College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western New Mexico University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Western Oregon University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Western State College of Colorado	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	N	N
Western Washington University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wheeling Jesuit University	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilmington University (Delaware)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wingate University	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			
Winona State University	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
YES	272	0	107	207	241	234	171	198	175	218	244	136	133	136
NO	1	274	45	72	37	36	108	79	105	59	8	141	129	131
ABSTAIN	0	0	129	1	2	10	2	2	0	3	26	2	1	0
TOTAL	273	274	281	280	280	280	281	279	280	280	278	279	263	267

# 104th Annual Convention

## LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

### SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals:

- Those letters and words that appear in *italics* and ~~striketrough~~ are to be deleted;
- Those letters and words that appear in **boldface** and are underlined are to be added; and
- Those letters and words that appear in normal text are unchanged from the current Division III legislation.]

---

#### DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

*The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III presidents or chancellors.*

*Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.*

*The Division III Presidents Council has identified one proposal that it believes is of particular interest to Division III presidents or chancellors and has included it in the Presidents Council grouping. That proposal has an asterisk before the proposal number identifying it by the Presidents Council for a roll-call vote.*

---

#### PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

*NO. 2010-1 (NO. 2-9)	<b>DIVISION MEMBERSHIP — DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT — AFFIRMATION OF PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AT INSTITUTIONAL, CONFERENCE AND NATIONAL GOVERNANCE LEVELS OF DIVISION III</b>
-----------------------	---

**Intent:** Specify in the Division III Philosophy Statement the expectation for presidential leadership and authority over intercollegiate athletics at the campus, conference and national governance levels.

**Bylaws:** Amend 20.11, as follows:

DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

20.11 DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS. Colleges and uni-

versities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience, and in which coaches play a significant role as educators. They also seek to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff.

To achieve this end, Division III institutions:

- (a) **Expect that institutional presidents and chancellors have the ultimate responsibility and final authority for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletics program at the institutional, conference and national governance levels;**

[20.11-(a) through 20.11-(n) renumbered as 20.11-(b) through 20.11-(o), unchanged.]

[Remainder of 20.11 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** Presidents and chancellors have the ultimate leadership responsibility within the NCAA's governance structure; however, the Division III Philosophy Statement currently contains no specific reference to the leadership expectations related to presidents and chancellors at the institutional, conference or national governance levels of the division. Specifically addressing this issue within the Division III Philosophy Statement will acknowledge and reinforce the ultimate authority that presidents and chancellors hold throughout Division III. The proposal is not intended to undermine institutional and conference autonomy in the exercise of this leadership role.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** None.

## GENERAL GROUPING

### NO. 2010-2 (NO. 2-5) ELIGIBILITY — TRANSFER REGULATIONS — RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT — DISCIPLINARY SUSPENSION — EXCEPTION

**Intent:** To specify that a transfer student who meets the requirements of the two-year nonparticipation exception shall be immediately eligible on transfer to the certifying institution, even if the student was disqualified or suspended from the previous institution for disciplinary reasons.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5, as follows:

#### 14.5 Transfer Regulations.

14.5.1 Residence Requirement - General Principle. A student who transfers (see Bylaw 14.5.2) to a member institution from any collegiate institution is required to complete one full academic year of residence at the certifying institution before being eligible to compete for or to re-

ceive travel expenses from the member institution (see Bylaw 16.8.1.2.), unless the student satisfies the applicable transfer requirements or receives an exception or waiver as set forth in this section.

[14.5.1.1 through 14.5.1.2 unchanged.]

14.5.1.3 Disciplinary Suspension. A student who transfers to any NCAA institution from a collegiate institution while the student is disqualified or suspended from the previous institution for disciplinary reasons (as opposed to academic reasons) must complete one calendar year or residence at the certifying institution.

**14.5.1.3.1 Exception. A student who transfers to the certifying institution and meets the requirements of the two-year nonparticipation exception set forth in Bylaws 14.5.4.2 or 14.5.5.1.3 is not required to complete one calendar year of residence.**

[Remainder of 14.5.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference and Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** The current rule requires a transferring student-athlete who leaves his or her previous institution under disciplinary suspension to serve a calendar year of residency in order to become eligible at the certifying institution, even if he or she was not enrolled full time for two years prior to enrollment at the certifying institution. The current requirement amounts to double jeopardy for such a student-athlete because a possible one-year sanction would actually be three years if he or she was not enrolled full time at any collegiate institution prior to the transfer. Therefore, this amendment would allow transfer students, who were on disciplinary suspension from the previous institution, to fulfill their sanctions by either serving a full calendar year of residency at their new institution or by meeting the requirements of the two-year nonparticipation exception. This amendment would also bring the disciplinary probation sanctions in line with academic probation sanctions, for there is currently an inequality between the fulfillment of disciplinary and academic probation sanctions with regard to the implementation of the two-year nonparticipation exception. If adopted, the optimum way to complete sanctions still remains the single calendar year of residency.

**Committee Position** (Presidents Council, Management Council, Academic Issues Subcommittee and Interpretations and Legislation Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council, Academic Issues Subcommittee and the Interpretations and Legislation Committee support this proposal and noted this will bring consistency to both academic and disciplinary sanctions. Further, the councils and committees recognized that the philosophy of the NCAA and Division III is that athletics is an integral part of a student's education and it is inconsistent to apply an excessive penalty to a student-athlete by withholding opportunities that would benefit the growth of the individual.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

**NO. 2010-3 (NO. 2-1) RECRUITING — TRYOUTS —  
DEREGULATION AND REFORMATTING  
OF TRYOUT — PERMISSIBLE AND  
NONPERMISSIBLE TRYOUTS**

**Intent:** To deregulate and reformat the tryout legislation to specify that a tryout in which prospective student-athletes demonstrate their athletics abilities at a coach's direction, tryout events and varsity competition against high school or preparatory school teams are impermissible; further, to specify that other physically related activities involving prospects that are not specifically prohibited shall be permissible.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 11.3, as follows:

11.3 Compensation and Remuneration. See Bylaw 11.01 for additional regulations regarding coaches' compensation and remuneration.

[11.3.1 unchanged.]

**11.3.2 Private Lessons. An institution's coach may teach private lessons to a prospective student-athlete, provided the following criteria are satisfied:**

- (a) The coach makes lessons available to the general public;**
- (b) Fees charged to the prospective student-athlete are at a rate commensurate with fees charged to all individuals;**
- (c) Prior written approval is provided annually by the institution's athletics director and the institution's athletics department keeps on file documentation of the fee charged for the private lessons; and**
- (d) Fees charged to the prospective student-athlete are not paid by individuals or entities other than the prospective student-athlete or prospective student-athlete's parents or guardian(s).**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.11, as follows:

13.11 Tryouts.

~~13.11.1 A member institution, on its campus or elsewhere, shall not conduct (or have conducted on its behalf) any physical activity (e.g., practice session and/or test/tryout) at which one or more prospective student athletes (as defined in Bylaw 13.11.1.1) reveal, demonstrate or display their athletics ability in any sport.~~

~~13.11.1.1 Definition of "Prospective Student Athlete" for Tryout Rule Purposes. For purposes of the tryout rule, the phrase "prospective student athlete" shall include any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade and is not enrolled in the member institution at the time of the practice or test therein described.~~

~~13.11.2 Additional Prohibited Tryout Activities. The following activities are also considered prohibited tryout activities.~~

~~13.11.2.1 Competition Against Prospective Student Athletes.~~

~~An institution's varsity intercollegiate team may compete against a two year college team but may not compete against a high school or preparatory school team. Subvarsity teams are not bound by this prohibition. The varsity team may participate in a contest against an established outside team that includes prospective student athletes, provided the outside team is ongoing and was not established for the specific purpose of competing against the collegiate team.~~

~~13.11.2.2 Competition in Conjunction with a High School, Preparatory School or Two Year College. A member institution may host competition between or among high schools, preparatory schools or two year colleges to be conducted in conjunction with an intercollegiate athletics event, provided all such competition occurs on the member institution's campus. Further, the intercollegiate athletics event may be conducted during a continuous session on the same day as the high school, preparatory school or two year college contest under a single admission.~~

~~13.11.2.3 Nonseholastic-Based Basketball. A member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving AAU basketball teams, regardless of the age or gender of the participants involved in such teams.~~

~~13.11.2.4 Tryout Events. A member institution or conference may not host, sponsor or conduct a tryout camp, clinic, group workout or combine (e.g., combination of athletics skills test or activities) devoted to agility, flexibility, speed and strength tests for prospective student athletes at any location. A member institution's staff members may only attend such an event sponsored by an outside organization if the events occurs off the institution's campus and is open to all institutions.~~

~~13.11.2.5 Effect of Violation. Violations of Bylaw 13.11 and its subsections shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student athlete's eligibility.~~

~~13.11.3 Tryout Exceptions. Each of the following activities are permissible activities and exceptions to the tryout prohibition.~~

~~13.11.3.1 Preseason Practice and Competition. A student athlete who is not enrolled, but who has been accepted for admission to the institution in a regular full-time program of studies, shall be permitted to engage in preseason practice and competition in fall sports or practice occurring in midyear between terms on the academic calendar.~~

~~13.11.3.2 Recreational Activities. A prospective student athlete visiting a member institution may participate in physical workouts or other recreational activities during a visit to an institution's campus, provided such activities:~~

- ~~(a) Are not organized or observed by members of the athletics department coaching staff; and~~

*(b) Are not designed to test the athletics abilities of the prospective student athlete.*

*13.11.3.3 Local Sports Clubs. An institution's coach may be involved in any capacity (e.g., as a participant, administrator or in instructional or coaching activities) in the same sport for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospective student athletes participating in said activities are legal residents of the area (within a 50 mile radius of the institution). The 50 mile radius restriction shall not apply to prospective student athletes who reside beyond the 50 mile radius of the institution if the local sports club is the nearest club team to the prospective student athlete's home. Further, in club teams involving multiple teams or multiple sports, the 50 mile radius is applicable only to the team with which the institution's coach is involved; however, it is not permissible for the coach to assign a prospective student athlete who lives outside the 50 mile area to another coach of the club. A coach also may be involved in activities with individuals who are not of prospective student athlete age (i.e., before the ninth grade), regardless of where such individuals reside.*

*13.11.3.3.1 Institutional Sponsorship of Local Sports Club. Neither an institution's athletics department nor an institution's athletics booster group may sponsor a local sports club that includes prospective student athletes. It is permissible for a department of the institution that operates independent of the athletics department (e.g., physical education department, recreation department) to sponsor a local sports club that includes prospective student athletes, provided no athletics department staff member is involved with the club team.*

*13.11.3.4 Sports Camps and Clinics. An institution's coach may be employed in sports camps, coaching schools and clinics per Bylaw 13.12.2.3 without violating the tryout rule.*

*13.11.3.5 Medical Examinations After Acceptance for Enrollment. It shall be permissible to administer medical examinations at any time to prospective student athletes who have been accepted for enrollment in a regular full-time program of studies at that institution, provided the examinations occur during an official paid visit or the prospective student athletes visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose.*

*13.11.3.6 "Open" Events. Participation by a prospective student athlete in "open" events conducted by or held on the campus of a member institution shall not be considered tryouts. Competition shall be considered "open" if the competitive event itself is not classified by age group or level of educational institution represented, and the selection of participants is not limited except by number, by geographical area or on the basis of some objective standard of performance.*

*13.11.3.7 Use of Facilities for Activities Related to a Nonsponsored Sport. The use of member institution's facilities for physical activities by a group that includes prospective student athletes shall not be considered a tryout, provided the physical activities are related to a sport that is not sponsored by the institution at the varsity intercollegiate level.*

*13.11.3.8 State, Regional, National or International Training Programs. Participation by an institution's athletics department staff member in recognized state, regional, national or international training programs or competition organized and administered by the applicable governing body or athletics authority shall not be considered tryouts.*

*13.11.3.8.1 Coach/Prospective Student Athlete Competition. It is permissible for an institution's coach to participate with or against prospective student athletes in recognized regional, national or international training programs or competition, provided the competition is regularly scheduled under the authority of an outside sports organization and both the coach and the prospective student athlete are eligible to enter the competition.*

*13.11.3.8.2 Administration of "State Games." A member institution serving as the site of "state games" is permitted to involve its staff members in the administration of the event but may not be involved in the selection or assignment of participants and coaches participating in the event.*

*13.11.3.9 High School, Preparatory School and Two Year College Contests Conducted by Institution or Sponsored Jointly with an Outside Organization. Regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school and two year college athletics contests or matches, conducted by a member institution or sponsored jointly with an outside organization and held on the campus of a member institution, shall not be considered tryouts, provided the following conditions are met [see Bylaw 13.2.3 for restrictions related to the provision of awards at such contests]:*

- (a) The opportunity to participate in the event is not limited to specific prospective student athletes or educational institutions and all individual prospective student athletes or educational institutions in a specific geographical area are eligible to compete (limited only by number, by institutional classification or on the basis of some objective standard of performance);*
- (b) The event appears on the schedules of the prospective student athletes' educational institutions; and*
- (c) The event is conducted by a national sports federation of which the NCAA is a member or it has been approved before the season by the appropriate state or national authority.*

~~13.11.3.10 Use of an Institution's Facilities by a High School, Preparatory School or Two Year College for Practice and Competition. The regular or emergency use of a member institution's facilities by a high school, preparatory school or two-year college athletics team for its normal practice activities (conducted solely by its coaches) or for regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school or two-year college contests (conducted solely by those participating institutions) shall not be considered tryouts, provided the following conditions are met:~~

- ~~(a) The competition is approved by the appropriate state or national authority; and~~
- ~~(b) The member institution and representatives of its athletics interests are not involved in any way in the invitation or selection of participating schools or individuals.~~

~~13.11.3.11 Officiating. An institution's coach may officiate competition that involves prospective student athletes, provided the competition is regularly scheduled under the authority of an outside sports organization.~~

~~13.11.3.12 Private Lessons. An institution's coach may teach private lessons to a prospective student athlete, provided the following criteria are satisfied:~~

- ~~(a) The coach makes lessons available to the general public;~~
- ~~(b) Fees charged to the prospective student athlete are at a rate commensurate with fees charges to all individuals;~~
- ~~(c) Prior written approval is provided annually by the institution's athletics director and the institution's athletics department keeps on file documentation of the fee charged for the private lessons; and~~
- ~~(d) Fees charged to the prospective student athlete are not paid by individuals or entities other than the prospective student athlete or prospective student athlete's parents or guardian(s).~~

~~13.11.3.13 Other Permissible Facility Usage. The use of institutional facilities for physical activities by a group that includes prospective student athletes, not otherwise permitted in these bylaws, may still be permissible and not considered a tryout provided that:~~

- ~~(a) Institution's athletics department staff or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are not involved in the promotion of the activity;~~
- ~~(b) Institution's athletics department staff or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are not involved in solicitation of any individual prospective student athlete's participation in the activity;~~
- ~~(c) Institution's athletics department staff or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are not involved in solie-~~

~~itation for any particular group's participation in the activity, unless the group is affiliated with an outside organization and the solicitation is consistent with institutional policies of hosting outside organizations;~~

- ~~(d) The activity may not be a tryout event, as defined in Bylaw 13.11.2.4;~~
- ~~(e) Involvement by the institution's athletics department staff and representatives of its athletics interests shall be consistent with institutional policies for hosting outside organizations; and~~
- ~~(f) Athletics department staff members and representatives of its athletics interests remain subject to all applicable NCAA recruiting legislation during the event.~~

**13.11.1 Prospective Student-Athlete Defined for Tryout-Rule Purposes.** For purposes of this section, the phrase "prospective student-athlete" shall include any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade and is not enrolled in the member institution at the time of the activity described. For an incoming student, the limitations of this section do not apply to preseason participation if the student has been accepted by the institution for enrollment in a regular, full-time program of studies and is no longer enrolled in the previous educational institution.

**13.11.2 Prohibited Physical Activities Involving Prospective Student-Athletes.**

**13.11.2.1 Traditional Tryout.** It is impermissible for an athletics department coaching staff member to observe or conduct physical workouts or other recreational activities designed to test the athletics abilities of a prospective student-athlete.

**13.11.2.2 Tryout Events.** It is impermissible for a member institution or conference to host, sponsor or conduct a tryout camp, clinic, group workout or combine (e.g., combination of athletics skills test or activities) devoted to agility, flexibility, speed and strength tests for prospective student-athletes. An institution's staff member may only attend such an event sponsored by an outside organization if the event occurs off the institution's campus and is open to all institutions.

**13.11.2.3 Competition Against Prospective Student-Athletes.** It is impermissible for an institution's varsity inter-collegiate team to compete against a high school or preparatory school team.

**13.11.3 Permissible Physical Activities Involving Prospective Student-Athletes.** Any activity not specifically prohibited in Bylaw 13.11.2 and its subsections is permissible. Permissible activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

**13.11.3.1 Athletics Events or Activities Involving Prospective Student-Athletes.** It is permissible for a member institution to host, sponsor, promote or conduct any type of athletics

event or activity involving prospective student-athletes that is not specifically prohibited within Bylaw 13.11.2.

13.11.3.2 Sports Camps and Clinics. See Bylaw 13.12.

13.11.3.3 Private Lessons. An institution's coach may teach private lessons to a prospective student-athlete, provided the criteria detailed in Bylaw 11.3.2 are satisfied.

13.11.3.4 Sports Club Teams. It is permissible for an institution's coach or administrator to be involved in any capacity (e.g., as a participant, administrator or in instructional or coaching activities) in an organized sports club or organization involving teams of prospective student-athletes; however, neither an institution's athletics department nor an institution's athletics booster group may sponsor a local sports club that includes prospective student-athletes. It is permissible for a department of the institution that operates independent of the athletics department (e.g., physical education department, recreation department) to sponsor a local sports club that includes prospective student-athletes, provided no athletics department staff member is involved with the club team.

13.11.4 Effect of Violation. Violations of Bylaw 13.11 and its subsections shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** The adoption of NCAA Division III Proposal Nos. 2009-10 and 2009-11 further defined the Division III tryout legislation by establishing two additional tryout exceptions. Despite the adoption of these proposals, it remains the case that the majority of the tryout exceptions are largely a product of prefederation legislation that may or may not speak to the current needs of Division III institutions, thereby creating challenges for institutions to apply the tryout legislation. This deregulation and reformatting effort would clarify the application of the tryout legislation by simplifying the list of tryout exceptions and emphasizing the three types of tryout activities that are not permissible. Specifically, the proposal emphasizes the continued prohibition on traditional tryouts in which prospective student-athletes demonstrate their athletics abilities at a coach's direction, "combine" events and varsity competition against high school or preparatory school teams. The other types of events under the list of exceptions that currently must meet prescriptive guidelines would also be deregulated to allow more institutional autonomy within the operation of the events. The proposal would also modify the local sports club exception such that the 50-mile radius limitation would be eliminated from that exception. The effective date would allow institutions to begin applying the simplified legislation immediately.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** Minimal. This proposal would allow for coach-

es to be employed by club teams for which they currently are not permitted to be employed and would also allow for some limited types of athletics events on campus that are currently not permitted.

**NO. 2010-4 (NO. 2-2) RECRUITING AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — TRYOUT EXCEPTION — RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY — EXCEPTION FOR FACILITY MONITORING AS PART OF NORMAL EMPLOYMENT ARRANGEMENT**

**Intent:** To permit an institution's coaching staff member to observe recreational activities of prospective student-athletes and nonorganized sport-specific activities of currently enrolled student-athletes, provided the coach observes these activities while monitoring an institutional facility for purposes of safety and facility security as part of normal employment duties and the facility is not restricted to specific users at the time.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.11.3, as follows:

13.11.3 Tryout Exceptions. Each of the following activities are permissible activities and exceptions to the tryout prohibition.

[13.11.3.1 unchanged.]

13.11.3.2 Recreational Activities. A prospective student-athlete visiting a member institution may participate in physical workouts or other recreational activities during a visit to an institution's campus, provided such activities:

- (a) Are not organized or observed by members of the athletics department coaching staff (**except as set forth in Bylaw 13.11.3.2.1**); and
- (b) Are not designed to test the athletics abilities of the prospective student-athlete.

**13.11.3.2.1 Permissible Observation of Recreational Activities. A coaching staff member who observes a prospective student-athlete engaging in recreational activities is not considered to be conducting a tryout, provided:**

- (a) **The documented job responsibilities for the coaching staff member include monitoring of an institutional facility for purposes of safety and facility security;**
- (b) **The observation occurs while the coaching staff member performs this monitoring responsibility; and**
- (c) **The observation occurs while the facility is open to the general public.**

**This exception does not permit a coaching staff member to direct, supervise or provide instruction to prospective student-athletes, but permits a coaching staff member to stop any activity that is dangerous to a prospective student-athlete or other students.**

[13.11.3.3 through 13.11.3.13 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.02.1.1, as follows:

17.02.1.1 Athletically Related Activities. The following are considered athletically related activities:

[17.02.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1-(j) unchanged.]

- (k) Observation by an institution's coaching staff member of enrolled student-athletes in nonorganized sport-specific activities (e.g., "pick-up games"), **except as permitted in Bylaw 17.02.1.1.1-(f).**

17.02.1.1.1 Exceptions. The following activities shall not be considered athletically related:

[17.02.1.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1.1-(c) unchanged.]

- (d) Observation of enrolled student-athletes in organized competition (e.g., summer league), provided institutional athletics personnel do not direct or supervise the organized activity; ~~and~~

- (e) Voluntary individual workouts monitored for safety purposes by strength and conditioning personnel. If the strength and conditioning coach is also a coaching staff member for one of the institution's intercollegiate teams, the monitoring may occur only if that staff member performs monitoring duties for all student-athletes using the facility at the time; ~~and~~

**(f) Observation of enrolled student-athletes in nonorganized sport-specific activities, provided:**

**(1) The documented job responsibilities for the coaching staff member include monitoring of an institutional facility for purposes of safety and facility security;**

**(2) The observation occurs while the coaching staff member performs this monitoring responsibility; and**

**(3) The observation occurs while the facility is open to all students.**

**This exception does not permit a coaching staff member to direct, supervise or provide instruction to student-athletes, but permits a coaching staff member to stop any activity that is dangerous to a student-athlete or other students.**

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [(Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee and Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** Currently, observing enrolled student-athletes in nonorganized sport-specific activities (e.g., "pick-up games") is considered an athletically related activity. An April 17, 2006, educational column stated that coaches can observe these activities if they are monitoring facilities in conjunction with their usual employment duties and the facilities are open to all students. The educational column was derived from language that appeared in the 2004 Convention Question and Answer guide convention floor discussion related to the elimination of the safety exception. This legislation is necessary to resolve the apparent conflict between current

legislation and these previously issued documents. Similarly, observing prospective student-athletes engaged in sport-specific activities on campus does not currently meet any of the tryout exceptions. This proposal would allow for the observation of prospective student-athletes when the coach is monitoring an institutional facility for purposes of safety and facility security as part of normal employment duties. These exceptions are appropriate and necessary to ensure proper facility monitoring and because campus personnel considerations currently put institutions in the difficult position of having to choose between not providing proper oversight of facilities or violating NCAA legislation.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** Some institutions may be able to save additional personnel dollars by allowing coaching staff members to monitor facilities as a part of their normal employment duties.

**NO. 2010-5 (NO. 2-6) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
LENGTH OF PLAYING SEASONS — END  
OF THE FALL AND SPRING  
NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENTS**

**Intent:** To specify that all practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.10.2, as follows:

17.1.10.2 Dividing Traditional and Nontraditional Segments. A member institution that divides its practice and playing season into two distinct segments per Bylaw 17.1.2 and conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall must complete all practice and competition ~~by October 30 of the academic year involved~~ **no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period**; conversely, a member institution that conducts its traditional segment in the fall may not begin practice or competition during its nontraditional segment until February 1 of the academic year involved.

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.2.4, as follows:

17.2.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (contests and scrimmages) in baseball by the following dates:

[17.2.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.4.4, as follows:

17.4.4 End of Regular Season. A member institution shall conclude all

practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in each segment in bowling by the following dates:

[17.4.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.4, as follows:

17.5.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition in cross country by the following dates:  
[17.5.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.7.4, as follows:

17.7.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (matches or practice matches) in fencing ~~by the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution~~ **no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 17.8.4, as follows:

17.8.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (contests and scrimmages) in field hockey by the following dates:

[17.8.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.4, as follows:

17.10.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition in golf by the following dates:

[17.10.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**H. Bylaws:** Amend 17.13.4, as follows:

17.13.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in lacrosse by the following dates:

[17.13.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**I. Bylaws:** Amend 17.15.4, as follows:

17.15.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in rowing by the following dates:

[17.15.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the nontraditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**J. Bylaws:** Amend 17.16.4, as follows:

17.16.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in rugby by the following dates:

[17.16.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~The first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **No later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**K. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.4, as follows:

17.19.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in soccer by the following dates:

[17.19.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the non-traditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**L. Bylaws:** Amend 17.20.4, as follows:

17.20.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in softball by the following dates:

[17.20.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the non-traditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**M. Bylaws:** Amend 17.21.4, as follows:

17.21.4 End of Regular Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in each segment in squash by the following dates:

[17.21.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~The first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **No later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**N. Bylaws:** Amend 17.22.4, as follows:

17.22.4 End of Regular Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in each segment in swimming and diving by the following dates:

[17.22.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~The first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **No later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**O. Bylaws:** Amend 17.23.4, as follows:

17.23.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition in tennis by the following dates:

[17.23.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For~~

~~an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the non-traditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**P. Bylaws:** Amend 17.24.4, as follows:

17.24.4 End of Regular Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in each segment in indoor and outdoor track and field by the following dates:

[17.24.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~The first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **No later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**Q. Bylaws:** Amend 17.25.7, as follows:

17.25.7 End of Regular Playing Season — Women. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in volleyball by the following dates:

[17.25.7-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall, October 30 (see Bylaw 17.1.10.2). For an institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the spring, the first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **All practice and competition conducted in the non-traditional segment (fall or spring) shall be completed no later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**R. Bylaws:** Amend 17.27.4, as follows:

17.27.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in wrestling by the following dates:

[17.27.4-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) Nontraditional Segment. ~~The first date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.~~ **No later than five weekdays before the first day of the institution's final examination period.**

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** Currently, the end date for the spring nontraditional segment is the day before the institution's final examination period. This date is not in the best interest of the student-athlete's academic pursuits and does not give the student-athlete sufficient time prior to final exams to focus on academics. Additionally, the end date for the fall nontraditional segment is not linked to the academic calendar, but rather is a defined date (Octo-

ber 30), which significantly limits the ability of institutions on a quarter academic calendar to conduct the fall nontraditional segment. This change establishes consistency between the end dates for the fall and spring nontraditional segments by linking the end of the fall nontraditional segment to the academic calendar instead of a defined date. By linking the fall end date to the academic calendar, quarter-based institutions will have greater flexibility to conduct the fall nontraditional segment. In addition, establishing the end date for the nontraditional segment as five weekdays before final examinations establishes a proper balance between the student-athlete's academic pursuits and the institution's flexibility to conduct its nontraditional segments.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** Potential cost savings for some institutions on the quarter system, which currently bring their student-athletes back to campus early to conduct the nontraditional segment activities.

**NO. 2010-6 (NO. 2-8) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
FOOTBALL — WALK-THROUGH  
SESSIONS DURING THE FIVE-DAY  
ACCLIMATIZATION PERIOD**

**Intent:** In football, to specify that an institution may conduct one one-hour walk-through session per day of the acclimatization period, provided protective equipment (e.g., helmet, shoulder pads) is not worn, equipment related to football (e.g., football, blocking sled) is not used and conditioning activities do not occur. Further, to specify that student-athletes must be provided with at least three hours of continuous recovery time between the end of the on-field practice session and the start of the walk-through session.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.11.2.2, as follows:

17.9.2.2 Five-Day Acclimatization Period. Preseason practice shall begin with a five-day acclimatization period for both first-time participants (e.g., freshman and transfers) and continuing student-athletes. All student-athletes, including those who arrive to preseason practice after the first day of practice, are required to undergo a five-day acclimatization period. The five-day acclimatization period shall be conducted as follows:

[17.9.2.2-(a) unchanged.]

- (b) During each day of the five-day period, participants shall not engage in more than one on-field practice ~~per day~~, not to exceed three hours in length, and one one-hour walk-through session. No protective equipment (e.g., helmet, shoulder pads) may be worn, no equipment related to football (e.g., football, blocking sled) may be used and conditioning activities may not occur during the walk-through session. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three hours of continuous recovery time between the end of the on-field practice session and the start of the walk-through session.

[Remainder of 17.9.2.2 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.11.2.3, as follows:

17.9.2.3 Preseason Activities After Five-Day Acclimatization Period. The

remaining preseason practice period shall be conducted as follows:

[17.9.2.3-(a) through 17.9.2.3-(d) unchanged.]

17.9.2.3.1 Exception — Walk-Through Sessions. During the preseason practice period only ~~and following the five-day acclimatization period~~, on-field walk-through sessions are not considered an on-field activity under Bylaw 17.9.2.3, provided protective equipment (e.g., helmets, shoulder pads) is not worn, equipment related to football (e.g., footballs, blocking sleds) is not used and conditioning activities do not occur. Walk-through sessions may occur only on days during which a single on-field practice session is permitted and shall be limited to one hour in length. Student-athletes must be provided with at least three hours of continuous recovery time between the end of the on-field practice session and the start of the walk-through session.

**Source:** American Southwest Conference, Empire 8 and New Jersey Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** The additional on-field interaction provides student-athletes a true walk-through for educational purposes of offensive, defensive and special team instruction during the preseason segment. The walk-through is limited to one hour in length with no protective equipment worn, no football equipment used and no conditioning activities occurring. Thus, the walk-through is not a strenuous activity. This proposal does not impact class time for the majority of Division III institutions since the acclimatization period normally occurs before classes are in session. This is permissive legislation and institutions would not be required to conduct the additional walk-through.

**Additional Info:** Student-Athlete Impact: Student-athletes could be required to participate in an additional five hours of on-field walk-through sessions during the five day acclimatization period.

**Committee Position** (Presidents Council, Management Council, Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and Championships Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council, Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and Championships Committee support this proposal. The councils and committees indicated that this would provide an additional teaching method that would benefit the student-athlete experience without significantly increasing the time involved in athletically related activities. Further, the councils and committees noted that Divisions I and II have previously implemented a similar provision and the data does not identify an increased risk of injury associated with allowing an educational walk-through session during which conditioning or typical practice activities are prohibited.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** None.

NO. 2010-7 (NO. 2-4) ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF PARTICIPATION — HARDSHIP WAIVER — PERCENT CALCULATION

**Intent:** To specify that a student-athlete's eligibility for a hardship waiver should be determined by a percent calculation using the maximum permissible number of contests or dates of competition for the applicable sport, plus one contest or date of competition.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.5, as follows:

14.2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of participation (per Bylaw 14.2.4) by the conference or the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement for reasons of "hardship." Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from a season-ending injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions:

- (a) The season-ending injury or illness occurs before the completion of the first half of the traditional playing season in that sport for the season being waived [measured by the ~~number of completed or scheduled (not exceeding the~~ maximum **contest or date of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport)** limitations in each sport as set forth in Bylaw 17 **plus one contest or date of competition. For the sport of cross country, see Bylaw 14.2.5.2.5.4, as set prior to the first scheduled contest or date of competition) contests or dates of competition] and results in incapacity to compete for the remainder of the traditional playing season; and**
- (b) The season-ending injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not competed in more than ~~three contests or dates of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport) or one-third (whichever number is greater)~~ of the ~~institution's completed or scheduled (not exceeding the~~ maximum **contest or date of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport)** limitations in each sport (as set forth in Bylaw 17) **plus one contest or date of competition. For the sport of cross country, see Bylaw 14.2.5.2.5.4, as set prior to the first scheduled contest or date of competition) ~~contests or dates of competition in his or her sport.~~ Only competition (excluding preseason scrimmages and exhibition contests but including scrimmages and exhibitions after the first regularly scheduled contest) against outside participants during the traditional playing season, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation in calculating ~~both~~ the number of contests or dates of competition in which the student-athlete has competed ~~and the number of completed or scheduled contests or dates of competition during that season in the sport.~~**

[14.2.5.1 through 14.2.5.2.4 unchanged.]

14.2.5.2.5 Percent Calculation. The following requirements are to be met in determining the percent calculation under this waiver provision: (Note: The percent calculation requirements set forth in Bylaws 14.2.5 and 14.2.5.2.3 apply only to the waiver provisions of this section and do not apply to the maximum- and

minimum-contests requirements in Bylaw 20.

14.2.5.2.5.1 Denominator in Percent Computation. The denominator in the institution's percent calculation shall be based on the ~~institution's number of completed or scheduled varsity contests or dates of competition [see Bylaw 14.2.5-(b)] as computed for playing and practice season purposes in Bylaw 17 for the applicable sport. (Note: Exempted events in Bylaw 17 are included in the percent calculation)~~ **maximum contest or date of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport) limitation in each sport (as set forth in Bylaw 17) plus one contest or date of competition. For the sport of cross country, see Bylaw 14.2.5.2.5.4.**

14.2.5.2.5.2 Fraction in Percent Computation. Any computation of the percent limitation that results in a fractional portion of a contest or date of competition shall be rounded to the next whole number (e.g., 33 percent of a 25-game basketball schedule — 8.3 games — shall be considered nine games).

~~14.2.5.2.5.3 Conference Championships. A conference championship shall be counted as one contest or date of competition in determining the institution's completed or scheduled contests or dates of competition in that sport, regardless of the number of days or games involved in the championship. However, for purposes of this regulation, the calculation of completed or scheduled contests or dates of competition in a particular season does not include post-season competition conducted after the completion of the institution's regular season schedule and conference tournament.~~

14.2.5.2.5.4 ~~43~~ NCAA Regional Cross Country Meet. The NCAA regional cross country meet may be counted as ~~one~~ **an additional** date of competition in determining the institution's scheduled or completed dates of competition, provided no qualifying standards exist for participation in the meet. **Therefore, in the sport of cross country, the denominator in the institution's percent calculation shall be based on the maximum dates of competition (as set forth in Bylaw 17) plus two dates of competition.**

[Remainder of 14.2.5 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** This proposal permits an institution to calculate the denominator for the hardship waiver percentage based on the maximum contests or dates of competition limits set forth in Bylaw 17 for the applicable sport plus one contest or date of competition. The addition of one contest or date of competition replaces the conference tournament provision in the current legislation. Student-athlete well-being is fostered by allowing a consistent

denominator for student-athletes, regardless of the institution's scheduling patterns and conference decision to have or not have a conference tournament. Because of conference, budgetary, philosophical and/or geographical constraints, institutions currently schedule different numbers of contests or dates of competition. Since the student-athletes have no role in scheduling, this creates inequitable treatment of student-athletes from institution to institution as far as waiver calculations are concerned. Further, since the scheduling practices of some institutions are incumbent on conference scheduling policies, even institutions cannot completely control the number of scheduled contests. This proposal allows for a denominator for all institutions that is equal to the largest possible denominator under current legislation and allows all student-athletes seeking a hardship waiver to take advantage of the maximum denominator.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** None.

**NO. 2010-8 (NO. 2-3) ELIGIBILITY — CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SEASON OF ELIGIBILITY — MINIMUM AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION — COMPETITION DURING THE NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT — BASEBALL, FIELD HOCKEY, LACROSSE, SOCCER, SOFTBALL AND WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL — ALUMNI CONTEST**

**Intent:** In baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball, to permit a student-athlete to participate in one date of competition and an alumni contest during the nontraditional segment without using a season of participation.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.4.1, as follows:

14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of Participation. A season of intercollegiate participation shall be counted in the student-athlete's sport when a student-athlete participates (practices or competes) during or after the first contest in the traditional segment following the student-athlete's initial participation of that academic year at that institution or when the student-athlete engages in intercollegiate competition during the nontraditional segment in that sport. This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics participation (practice or competition) conducted by a Division III collegiate institution at the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team level.

14.2.4.1.1 Exceptions. A season of participation shall not be counted:

[14.2.4.1.1-(a) unchanged.]

(b) In baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball, when a student-athlete participates ~~in the one date of competition~~ **(practices or competes)** during the nontraditional segment.

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** Under current legislation, a student-athlete may participate in the one permissible date of competition during the nontraditional segment (in baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball) without using a season of participation. If an institution conducts an alumni contest in addition to the one date of competition, a student-athlete would use a season of participation if he or she competes in the alumni contest. This proposal would allow the student-athlete to participate in both the alumni contest and the one date of competition in the nontraditional segment without using a season of participation. This proposal would provide simplicity to the application of the legislation, because the adoption of the proposal would clarify that competition within the nontraditional segment would never trigger the use of a season of participation. The alumni contest would continue to count as one of the 16 permissible days of athletically related activities. Alumni contests are conducted primarily for positive public relations and should not adversely affect a student-athlete's eligibility. Since the alumni contest counts as one of the 16 permissible days of athletically related activity, this proposal would not increase the length of the playing season.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** None.

**NO. 2010-9 (NO. 2-7) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FIRST CONTEST OR DATE OF COMPETITION — EXEMPTED ALUMNI CONTEST**

**Intent:** To permit institutions to conduct the exempted alumni contest at any time during the playing season, including prior to the first permissible contest date.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.3.1, as follows:

17.3.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted before the first contest dates specified under Bylaw 17.3.3:

[17.3.3.1-(a) through 17.3.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

- (c) Foreign-Team Games. An exhibition contest against a foreign team in the United States played in the arena in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests may be played on or after November 1 by an institution; ~~and~~
- (d) NCAA Division I or II Institution. An institution may play one exhibition contest (which shall not count toward the institution's win-loss record) against a Division I or II institution on or after October 31 and before the first permissible contest date; ~~and~~
- (e) **Alumni Contest. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni contest [see Bylaw 17.3.5.3-(g)] on or after October 15, provided the contest occurs during the declared playing season.**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.3, as follows:

17.5.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (contest or scrimmage) against outside compe-

tition in cross country before the following dates:

[17.5.3-(a) through 17.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

**17.5.3.1 Exception. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni meet [see Bylaw 17.5.3-(e)] before the specified first date of competition, provided the meet occurs during the declared playing season.**

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.8.3, as follows:

17.8.3 First Contest or Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest or engage in its first date of competition (contest or scrimmage) against outside competition in field hockey before the following dates:

[17.8.3-(a) through 17.8.3-(b) unchanged.]

**17.8.3.1 Exception. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni game (see Bylaw 17.8.5.3.2) before the specified first date of competition, provided the game occurs during the declared playing season.**

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.3, as follows:

17.10.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition against outside competition in golf before the following dates:

[17.10.3-(a) through 17.10.3-(b) unchanged.]

**17.10.3.1 Exception. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni match [see Bylaw 17.10.5.3-(e)] before the specified first date of competition, provided the match occurs during the declared playing season.**

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.16.3, as follows:

17.16.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) against outside competition in women's rugby before the following dates:

[17.16.3-(a) through 17.16.3-(b) unchanged.]

**17.16.3.1 Exception. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni contest [see Bylaw 17.16.5.3-(d)] before the specified first date of competition, provided the contest occurs during the declared playing season.**

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.3, as follows:

17.19.3 First Contest or Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest or engage in its first date of competition (game) against outside competition in soccer before the following dates:

[17.19.3-(a) through 17.19.3-(b) unchanged.]

**17.19.3.1 Exception. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni game (see Bylaw 17.19.5.3.2) before the specified first date of competition, provided the game occurs during the declared playing season.**

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 17.23.3, as follows:

17.23.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage

in its first date of competition (match or practice match) against outside competition in tennis before the following dates:

[17.23.3-(a) through 17.23.3-(b) unchanged.]

**17.23.3.1 Exception. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni match [see Bylaw 17.23.5.3-(e)] before the specified first date of competition, provided the match occurs during the declared playing season.**

**H. Bylaws:** Amend 17.25.3, as follows:

17.25.3 First Date of Competition — Women. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) against outside competition in women's volleyball before the following dates:

[17.25.3-(a) through 17.25.3-(b) unchanged.]

**17.25.3.1 Exception. An institution may conduct an exempted alumni game [see Bylaw 17.25.5.3-(e)] before the specified first date of competition, provided the match occurs during the declared playing season.**

**I. Bylaws:** Amend 17.26.4, as follows:

17.26.4 First Date of Competition — Men. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) against outside competition in men's water polo before the first Saturday in September.

**17.26.4.1 Exception. An institution may play an exempted alumni game [see Bylaw 17.26.8.3-(f)] before the specified first date of competition, provided the game occurs during the declared playing season.**

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2010.

**Rationale:** Currently, an exempted alumni contest may be conducted during the nontraditional segment or during the traditional segment on or after the first permissible contest date. The alumni contest is an important public relations event for institutions and for keeping alumni connected to the institution. Therefore, institutions should be afforded the maximum opportunity to conduct these events without lengthening the season. This proposal would provide institutions the opportunity to conduct the contest during the preseason when schedules might be more amenable to this type of contest. This proposal would not lengthen the season as the contest would still have to occur within the 18- or 19-week playing season.

**Estimated Financial Impact:** None.

**2010 NCAA CONVENTION DIVISION III VOTING RESULTS**  
**(Saturday, January 16, Business Session)**

PROPOSAL NO.	BUSINESS SESSION	RESULT	COUNT
1	III	Adopted	466 – 0 – 0
2	III	Adopted	418 – 43 – 4
3* (motion to divide 13.11.2.3)	III	Motion Failed	105 – 354 – 9
3*	III	Adopted	385 – 76 – 3
4*	III	Adopted	340 – 120 – 6
5 (motion to divide sections G, I, O)	III	Motion Failed	194 – 258 – 14
5	III	Adopted	368 – 90 – 6
6	III	Adopted	342 – 36 – 84
7	III	Adopted	441 – 20 – 1
8	III	Adopted	433 – 18 – 10
9	III	Adopted	453 – 4 – 1

\*Effective immediately

**Proposal No. 2010-1**  
**Proposal No. 2010-2**  
**No. 2010-3 Motion to Divide**  
**Proposal No. 2010-3**  
**Proposal No. 2010-4**  
**Proposal No. 2010-5**  
**No. 2010-5 Motion to Divide**  
**Proposal No. 2010-6**  
**Proposal No. 2010-7**  
**Proposal No. 2010-8**  
**Proposal No. 2010-9**

<b>DIVISION III — VOTING RESULTS</b>											
Adrian College	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Agnes Scott College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Albertus Magnus College	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Albion College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Albright College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alfred University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Allegheny College	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Alma College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alvernia University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alverno College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
American Southwest Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Amherst College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Anderson University (Indiana)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anna Maria College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arcadia University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Augsburg College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Augustana College (Illinois)	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	A	Y
Aurora University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Austin College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Averett University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Babson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Baldwin-Wallace College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Baptist Bible College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bard College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y
Baruch College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Bates College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Bay Path College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Becker College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Beloit College	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Benedictine University (Illinois)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bethany College (West Virginia)	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bethany Lutheran College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Bethel University (Minnesota)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Blackburn College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			
Bluffton University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bowdoin College	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Brandeis University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bridgewater State College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Brooklyn College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Bryn Mawr College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Buena Vista University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	N
State University College at Buffalo	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cabrini College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
California Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
California Lutheran University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Calvin College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A		Y	Y
Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Capital University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carleton College	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Carnegie Mellon University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carroll University (Wisconsin)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carthage College	Y	Y	N		N	N	N	Y	Y		Y
Case Western Reserve University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Castleton State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Catholic University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cazenovia College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Cedar Crest College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Centenary College (New Jersey)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Centennial Conference	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central College (Iowa)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Centre College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chapman University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chatham University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Christopher Newport University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
City University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clark University (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Clarkson University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Coe College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colby College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Colby-Sawyer College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	
College at Brockport, State University of New York	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College Conference of Illinois & Wisconsin	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A	Y
College of Mount St. Joseph	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Mount St. Vincent	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of New Rochelle	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
College of Notre Dame (Maryland)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

College of Saint Elizabeth	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of St. Benedict	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
College of Staten Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
College of Wooster	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Colonial States Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colorado College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Concordia College, Moorhead	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia University (Wisconsin)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia University Chicago	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia University Texas	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Connecticut College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Cornell College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Crown College (Minnesota)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Curry College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Daniel Webster College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Defiance College	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Delaware Valley College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Denison University	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
DePauw University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
DeSales University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dickinson College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dominican University (Illinois)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Drew University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
D'Youville College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Earlham College	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
East Texas Baptist University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Eastern Connecticut State University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Eastern Mennonite University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Eastern Nazarene College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Eastern University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Edgewood College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Elizabethtown College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Elmhurst College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A	Y
Elmira College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Elms College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Emerson College	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Emmanuel College (Massachusetts)	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Emory and Henry College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Emory University	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Empire 8	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Endicott College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Eureka College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ferrum College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Finlandia University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fitchburg State College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Fontbonne University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Framingham State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Franklin & Marshall College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Franklin College	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Frostburg State University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gallaudet University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
George Fox University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Gettysburg College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gordon College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	
Goucher College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Great Northeast Athletic Conference	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Great South Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Green Mountain College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Greensboro College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Greenville College	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grinnell College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Grove City College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Guilford College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gustavus Adolphus College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gwynedd-Mercy College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hamilton College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Hamline University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hampden-Sydney College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hanover College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Hardin-Simmons University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hartwick College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Haverford College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Heidelberg University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hendrix College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hilbert College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hiram College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hobart & William Smith Colleges	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hollins University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Hood College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Hope College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Howard Payne University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hunter College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y
Huntingdon College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Husson University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Illinois College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Illinois Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	A	Y
Immaculata University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ithaca College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
John Carroll University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Johns Hopkins University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Johnson and Wales University (Rhode Island)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Johnson State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Juniata College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kalamazoo College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kean University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Keene State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Kenyon College	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Keuka College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N		N	Y	Y
Keystone College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
King's College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Knox College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
LaGrange College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
La Roche College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Lake Forest College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Lakeland College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Landmark Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lasell College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Lawrence University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lebanon Valley College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lehman College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y
Lesley University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
LeTourneau University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lewis & Clark College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Liberty League	Y	Y	A	A	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Linfield College			N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Little East Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Loras College	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
Louisiana College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Luther College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lycoming College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lynchburg College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Macalester College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MacMurray College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maine Maritime Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Manchester College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Manhattanville College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maranatha Baptist Bible College	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Marian University (Wisconsin)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marietta College	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Martin Luther College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mary Baldwin College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marymount University (Virginia)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maryville College (Tennessee)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marywood University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
McDaniel College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
McMurry University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Medaille College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Medgar Evers College	Y	Y	N	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Menlo College	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Meredith College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Messiah College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Methodist University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association	Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Middle Atlantic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Middlebury College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Midwest Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Millikin University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	A	Y
Mills College	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Millsaps College	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Milwaukee School of Engineering	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Misericordia University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mississippi College	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mitchell College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Monmouth College (Illinois)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Montclair State University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Moravian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Morrisville State College	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Aloysius College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Mount Holyoke College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y				
Mount Ida College	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Mary College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Saint Mary College (New York)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Union College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Muhlenberg College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Muskingum College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nazareth College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Neumann University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
New England College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
New England Collegiate Conference	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
New England Small College Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
New England Women's & Men's Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Jersey Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
New Jersey City University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
New York City College of Technology	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Newbury College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nichols College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Atlantic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Central College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A	Y
North Coast Athletic Conference	Y	N	N	Y	A	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
North Eastern Athletic Conference	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Park University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y
Northern Athletics Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northland College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Northwest Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northwestern College (Minnesota)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Norwich University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oberlin College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Occidental College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oglethorpe University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Athletic Conference	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Northern University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Wesleyan University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Old Dominion Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Olivet College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Otterbein College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pacific Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pacific University (Oregon)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Peace College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Penn State Berks College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Penn State University, Altoona	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania State University Erie, the Behrend College	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Philadelphia Biblical University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
Piedmont College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Pine Manor College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Plattsburgh State University of New York	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Plymouth State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Polytechnic Institute of New York University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Presentation College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Presidents' Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Principia College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Purchase College, State University of New York	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ramapo College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Randolph College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Randolph-Macon College	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Regis College (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rhode Island College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Rhodes College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y

Ripon College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rivier College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roanoke College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Rochester Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rockford College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roger Williams University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rosemont College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Rowan University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Camden	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
St. Joseph's College (Maine)	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Mary's College (Indiana)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
St. Mary's University of Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Salem College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Salem State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Salisbury University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Salve Regina University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Schreiner University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Shenandoah University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Simmons College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y		Y
Simpson College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Skidmore College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Skyline Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Smith College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Vermont College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Southwestern University (Texas)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Spelman College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Springfield College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Catherine University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. John Fisher College		Y	N								
St. John's University (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Joseph College (Connecticut)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
St. Joseph's College (Long Island)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Lawrence University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Mary's College of Maryland	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Norbert College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Olaf College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Fredonia	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
State University College at New Paltz	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Old Westbury	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Oneonta	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York at Cortland	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

State University of New York at Farmingdale	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York at Geneseo	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York at Oswego	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York at Potsdam	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Maritime College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Stevens Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stevenson University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Suffolk University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Sul Ross State University	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Susquehanna University	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Swarthmore College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Sweet Briar College	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas Lutheran University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
The City College of New York	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
The College of New Jersey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
The College of St. Scholastica	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
The Commonwealth Coast Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
The Sage Colleges	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	
Thiel College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
Thomas College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thomas More College	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Transylvania University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Trine University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity College (Connecticut)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity College (District of Columbia)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity University (Texas)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tufts University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Union College (New York)	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of California, Santa Cruz	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Chicago	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Dallas	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
University of Dubuque	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of La Verne	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Maine, Presque Isle	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Maine, Farmington	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Mary Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Massachusetts, Boston	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Minnesota, Morris	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of New England	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y

University of Pittsburgh, Bradford	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Puget Sound	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Redlands	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Rochester	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Scranton	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y
University of Southern Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Texas at Dallas	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Texas at Tyler	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of the Ozarks (Arkansas)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of the South	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, La Crosse	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Platteville	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, River Falls	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Stout	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Superior	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin, Whitewater	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Upper Midwest Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ursinus College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA South Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Utica College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vassar College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Virginia Wesleyan College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Wabash College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Wartburg College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington and Jefferson College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington and Lee University	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Washington College (Maryland)	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington University in St. Louis	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Waynesburg University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Webster University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Wellesley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Wells College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wentworth Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Wesley College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wesleyan College (Georgia)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wesleyan University (Connecticut)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Western Connecticut State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western New England College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westfield State College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westminster College (Missouri)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westminster College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Wheaton College (Illinois)	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	A	Y
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Wheelock College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Whitman College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Whittier College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y
Whitworth University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Widener University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilkes University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Willamette University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y
William Paterson University of New Jersey	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Williams College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Wilmington College (Ohio)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilson College	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wisconsin Lutheran College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wittenberg University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Worcester State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Yeshiva University	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
York College (New York)	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
York College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y
YES	466	418	105	385	340	368	194	342	441	433	453
NO	0	43	354	76	120	90	258	36	20	18	4
ABSTAIN	0	4	9	3	6	6	14	84	1	10	1
TOTAL	466	465	468	464	466	464	466	462	462	461	458



**The NCAA salutes the more than  
400,000 student-athletes  
participating in 23 sports at  
more than 1,000 member institutions**